

Community Service News

Vol. XII July-Dec., 1954 Nos. 3 & 4

BOTTOM-UP DEMOCRACY

The Affiliation of Small Democratic Units for Common Service

The Preservation of Small-Scale Democracy, by Arthur E. Morgan	67
Democracy versus Power	76
Village Elders and Their Modern Counterparts, by Arthur E. Morgan . .	77
Trusteeship or Dictatorship, by Arthur E. Morgan	79
E Pluribus Unum: A New Policy for Suburban Communities, by Griscom Morgan	85
Consolidation: Barrier to Development of Community Schools, by Maurice F. Seay	94
Affiliation of Community Schools for Common Services, by Griscom Morgan	96
Is the Country School Doomed? by Laura Lane	108
How Switzerland Resists Centralization, by Demaree Bess	110
How Finland Tries to Stabilize Small Business, by Arthur E. Morgan . .	113
Southern Illinois, Inc.	117
Quotes	118
REVIEWS	
"Leadership and Authority in the Local Community," <i>Autonomous Groups Bulletin</i> , Summer-Autumn 1952	123
<i>The Community School and the Intermediate Unit</i> , Dept. of Rural Education of the National Education Assn.	125
<i>Building a Better Home Town</i> , by H. Clay Tate	127

*Published quarterly by Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio. Subscrip-
tion \$2.00 per year, two years \$3.00. 50¢ per copy.*

This double issue of *Community Service News*, edited by Arthur E. and Griscom Morgan, is also being published as a separate booklet, under the same title. It may be purchased from Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio, for \$1.00 a copy, 5 copies for \$4.00.

Now available in bound volume:

COMMUNITY SERVICE NEWS—Issues for 1952-53 (Vols. X-XI) \$6.50

Includes the book, *Industries for Small Communities*, issued as Nos. 1-2 of Volume XI. Dark green buckram binding, uniform with previous years.

Also available, limited supply: Vols. IV-V, \$4; VI-VII, \$4; VIII-IX, \$5.50. All eight years (Vols. IV-XI, 1946-53, in four bound volumes) \$17.50.

Industries for Small Communities, With Cases from Yellow Springs, by Arthur E. Morgan. Selected by *Library Journal* as one of 50 best business books of 1953. \$2.00 (paper binding \$1.50).

Order from:

COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC., Box 243, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Community Service News, issued quarterly by Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio, \$2.00 per year, two years \$3.00. Griscom Morgan, editor.

Community Service, Inc., is an organization to promote the interests of the community as a basic social institution, concerned with the economic, recreational, educational, cultural and spiritual development of its members. Community Service was incorporated in 1940 as a non-profit organization to supply information and service for small communities and their leaders, in the belief that the decay of the American community constitutes a crisis which calls for steady and creative effort. The nation-wide interest expressed during the succeeding years has reinforced this opinion.

THE PRESERVATION OF SMALL-SCALE DEMOCRACY

by ARTHUR E. MORGAN

This collection of articles deals with a general process which will help in the preservation, strengthening and improvement of democratic institutions, especially on the community level and in other small units. With world-wide increase of literacy and communication, a general method is emerging in many unrelated situations, in industry, education, local government and elsewhere, which gives hope that genuinely democratic processes may be able to withstand such stresses as those to which small-unit democracy nearly always has been subjected since feudalism and empire began to exert centralizing power in a world mostly consisting of independent villages, cities and other small social units.

The term "democracy" has been given many meanings. As a preliminary to the articles describing this emerging method in several fields, a discussion of the use of that term and of the status of democracy, especially on a small scale, may be in order.

Most genuinely primitive societies have been democratic in their social structure. With the rise of feudalism and empire there was general absorption and destruction of small-scale democracy. Yet even during that long period various democracies survived or emerged, and developed great vigor before they, too, fell prey to centralized power. Greece and Rome are among such cases best known to us. Some such democracies lasted longer than has our own, though not on such a vast scale. In a few instances the ancient democracy never was extinguished.

The forces and tendencies that brought other democracies to their downfall, or to their transition into dictatorships, are powerfully at work in our present-day society. Whether we can surmount those stresses and weaknesses will depend on whether we understand the nature of our democracy, and have the character to profit by that understanding.

There are two general sources of government and/or organization. One is the association of men by mutual consent. That is democracy. The other source of government is the imposition of authority by conquest. Such conquest may be by military action or by any other form of physical, economic, social, or mental mastery. The maintenance of authority by conquest, or by control from above following conquest, takes many forms and has many names, some of those forms being respected or even revered by those who have been effectively indoctrinated in them.

While democracy is based on mutual agreement and on the control of life by those being controlled, yet always this principle of self-direction is qualified by the need of control from above or from without in case of infancy or irresponsibility. Democracy deals with such limitations in a spirit of trusteeship; that is, with intent and effort to promote maturity and responsibility, and to displace trusteeship by responsible self-direction.

Nondemocratic or antidemocratic power based on conquest, or on indoctrination or control following conquest, usually does not have a spirit of trusteeship; that is, it does not strive to end the need for control from without by encouraging maturity and responsible self-direction. Rather it assumes that irresponsibility and immaturity are permanent. It discourages inquiry and self-directed activity within the fields of its control, and tries to maintain its power over its wards.

Sometimes truly democratic action arises from widely felt needs and desires without any marked element of leadership. However, since men differ greatly in insight, vigor and purposefulness, democratic action relies much on leadership—patterns of thought and action which originate with the few and are transmitted to and voluntarily accepted by the many. But leadership has no necessary relation to conquest or to imposed authority. In order that this discussion may be more easily intelligible, it may be well to illustrate how these contrary processes operate.

First we will give an example of democracy in action. For more than a century municipal government in America followed a conventional pattern. Neither from local inhabitants nor from erudite specialists in government was a better alternative pattern clearly envisaged and effectively presented. Then in 1908, in the very small Virginia city of Staunton, from the stress of dealing with problems of local government, a new pattern emerged which followed the dictates of simple common sense in local government. The success of this pattern, called the city-manager or council-manager plan, conceived, born and adopted in Staunton, became an example to the nation.

The fact that this municipal management method of local government worked well and seemed inherently reasonable has led gradually to its adoption by many villages, towns and cities, commonly through the stimulation of local leadership. Many or most of the municipalities adopting municipal-manager government modified the process in detail in an effort to improve it or to adapt it to local needs and conditions. There has been no imposition from above, but local initiative and decision in each case.

After there had been more than a quarter-century of experience with this form of local government a voluntary organization drafted and recommended for general adoption a typical council-manager charter. Even so, seldom does another municipality adopt that recommended form without

some modification to meet local needs or conditions, or to secure improvement. Usually a locally elected charter commission drafts a form of charter which then is adopted or rejected by vote of the people.

By this process of free, democratic decision, following the general pattern provided by the leadership of one community, about 1150 villages, towns and cities in our country have adopted this type of local government. The merit of the method having been proved by nearly half a century of experience, it is being slowly extended to county government. With that further use of the method in process of adoption, suggestions are being made that the council-manager process would be equally effective for state government. In that case a small elective legislative council would control legislation and general policy, and would appoint a governor who would administer the state business with a staff of his own selection.

Council-manager government for villages, cities and counties has emerged and spread by a genuinely democratic process. The essential features of this process have been: first, responsible freedom as local communities; second, leadership—in this case the action of a single small city serving as an example and demonstration; and third, the free, voluntary action of other communities, often with strong local leadership, in choosing this form of municipal government, with such variations as are locally determined on. In some cases the locally devised modifications, especially those providing for a small unicameral council and for a short ballot, have been proved to be improvements, and have come to be generally adopted over the country. In other cases political influence or special interests have been able to secure distorted charters, which usually have been discredited by their operation.

Largely due to the fact that the existing type of local government was working tolerably well, or because of cautious conservatism or inertia, or because of the opposition of party politics or of other special interests, less than ten per cent of American municipalities have adopted this superior form of municipal government, though the rate of its adoption is increasing. Genuine democracy usually moves slowly and deliberately.

An example of antidemocratic social organization is supplied by the reputedly democratic government of France. Following the French Revolution with its totalitarian philosophy, the French public school system was developed with complete control from the center. This was illustrated by the often quoted remark of a French minister of education, that he could look at his watch at any moment of the school day and know what every school child in France was studying. The participation of parents or of the local community in the formation of school policy was not wanted. This lack of stimulus to local initiative may have something to do with the halting progress of French democracy.

For many centuries some kind of conquest, or control following conquest, has had a seemingly dominant part in determining the structure of human society. Sometimes it takes the form of sheer military conquest, in which the defeated society is reduced to servitude or vassalage. Sometimes there is forcible annexation of territory and incorporation of the conquered society or area into the conquering society or organization. Sometimes partial freedom is left, on condition of the payment of tribute.

Since military or other forcible conquest is precariously insecure, it commonly is brought about or followed by indoctrination, so that succeeding generations will willingly accept their servitude, and even defend it with their lives. Indoctrination is a form of conquest. Political, economic and religious conquest is maintained in that way. Democracy cannot exist without freedom of inquiry and opinion.

Rule by conquest almost never has wholly eliminated the indigenous democracy of common life. Seldom in the past has a regime of imposed power carried its administration close enough to the intimate common life to extinguish democratic relations close to the soil. Always there remain areas of living where mutual regard, and living and working by mutual agreement, still persist. As individuals rise from these lowly levels to positions of responsibility they sometimes carry with them their democratic ways, and tend to reinforce government with democracy. Even in extreme dictatorships the spirit of democracy persists, especially in small, intimate community settings. It seems that even the "brain washing" of Russia and China does not eliminate that spirit.

On the other hand, even the most democratic countries, such as Switzerland and America, are infiltrated with many elements and with much of the spirit of control based on conquest or on power from above. Switzerland, surrounded by autocracies, could not completely insulate itself from their spirit. America, settled mostly from the lower classes of Europe, had a strong craving for democratic self-determination. But there was also brought to our country in some of the traditions of government, business, society and religion, an undemocratic temper, mostly established and maintained by arbitrary power and indoctrination.

As a result of these contrasting influences modern society is a mixture of democracy, or action by mutual agreement, and dictatorship, or action based on some form of conquest or imposed authority. These two ways of organizing or governing society are always opposed. Those who hold their status by arbitrary power come to believe that they alone have the wisdom, insight, and decision for administration of the society they control. They do not have an attitude of trusteeship which aims to encourage responsible self-direction. Always the democratic spirit wishes to control its own destiny and

to arrive at social programs by mutual respect and agreement, and not by arbitrary power.

This conflict exists not only between different elements of the population, but within individual personalities, as a result of mixed and inconsistent elements of background and tradition. Many persons who sincerely believe themselves to be democratic in spirit, in some phases of their lives, as in economics or religion, are strongly antidemocratic, having been taught that those are separate worlds with which democracy has nothing to do. In such fields they believe that control from above is desirable, and do not have a feeling of trusteeship which sees control from above as a temporarily necessary attitude toward immaturity or irresponsibility, to be done away with as soon as reasonable maturity and responsibility are achieved. Undemocratic tendencies are increased by the craving of many men for power, which they try to get or to hold by some sort of conquest on a large or small scale.

Thus the contrasting traditions and forces of democracy, or social order based on mutual respect and agreement, and of dictatorship, based on some form of conquest and indoctrination, run through every phase of modern society, in this as in every other country. The conflict between them cannot be resolved by any dramatic act of decision, but only by patient, persistent effort to disentangle threads of belief, motive, interest and method.

Democratic structure by itself is not enough to preserve democracy. As men get power they come to like more power, and to feel that they have superior ability to rule. I recall that when being counseled on my job as Chairman of the TVA by one of the original "brain trusters" of the New Deal, I was told as a parting admonition, "And never let the public know what you are aiming at." Some state departments of education consciously hold that they are the authorities in charge of the public schools, and that the local communities have no rights in them. Some of the most depreciating or contemptuous remarks I have ever heard about the rank and file of members of labor unions have been made by union officials, who considered it their business not to lead men competent for self-direction, but by power and strategy to control an incompetent following. I have personally been put under extreme pressure by a powerful public utility executive and threatened with severe punishment if I should encourage competition with his company in a limited part of its area. (This was prior to, and had nothing to do with, the TVA.) When I remarked that his was a strange attitude to meet in America, his response was, "That is the way business is done." There are large and powerful religious organizations which maintain power over their followers by discouraging free inquiry, maintaining an index of prohibited reading, indoctrinating childhood until the spirit of inquiry is killed, and claiming unique authority which is above inquiry or criticism.

The regular army of our country, with the Prussian-born tradition of West Point, has been nondemocratic in its methods, and would indoctrinate young America in its spirit.

Thus there is no single phase of life or any one class or calling which is primarily responsible for infringement on democratic society. Men and organizations of men that have power tend to crave more power, and to undermine or to overcome democratic society around them.

Especially the *small democratic unit* in any field has difficulty in preserving its democratic autonomy. Yet it is primarily the small democratic unit that is the school of democracy. It is by exercising initiative, independence, mutual regard and mutual effort on a small scale that the democratic temper is exercised and trained for larger activities. If self-direction and mutual effort in small-scale intimate relations are killed, then democracy is killed at its root, and the tree will soon wither.

If small-scale democratic units are to survive, it must be by developing both a spirit and a technique of survival. Without a spirit of human dignity, courage, integrity and good will, no technique of survival will be enduringly effective. Yet method is important. It is with that method or technique that this collection of articles is concerned.

During the past century or two a new vision of democracy and a passion for self-direction have been coming to men. Yet modern technology and organization are pressing powerfully toward centralization and toward the elimination of small-scale autonomy. Power tends to absorb what is within reach. Thus there have developed increased stresses and new dilemmas. The small democratic unit has difficulty in maintaining its autonomy while standing alone.

Out of these new stresses are arising new ways, or increasing emphasis on old ways, for preserving the values of small-scale autonomy while winning the values of modern developments. In general, the best prospect for survival and increase of small democratic units is in voluntary association of equals, acting in accord with the old dictum, "In union there is strength."

* * *

One of the oldest examples of democratic association for the preservation of small-scale independence is the government of Switzerland. One can get a hint of the ancient social structure of central and northern Europe from the many old folk tales of the boy who walked all day through the forest, and at night came to a strange kingdom. Units of government were about that large. Over most of Europe a process of conquest and compulsion absorbed most of these small units into baronies and empires. In the Alps, on the

contrary, twenty-two of these small more or less independent units have united during a period of 700 years and have maintained freedom through a federation of free and equal peoples. The spirit of independence was not confined to political life, but has expressed itself in other areas. We include a part of an article from the *Saturday Evening Post* which indicates this spirit in Switzerland.

The local autonomy of union labor which has been largely achieved in Switzerland, as indicated in this article, is still an issue in America. At present there is a move for the unification of all union labor in the country. A question at issue is whether such union should be on the basis of voluntary association of free unions, or the subordination of the several unions to an all-powerful central executive. The attitude of the United Steelworkers was expressed by David J. McDonald, president of that organization. We quote from a report of his speech in *Steel Labor* of October 1954:

The plan [for labor unity] calls for super-organization of all "democratic free trade union organizations in America," including the CIO, the AFL, the United Mine Workers and the Railroad Brotherhoods. Predominating the new setup would be "the principle of voluntarism."

In the new combined labor movement, the Steelworkers' president stressed, all unions would be absolutely free to affiliate or remain outside. . . .

"By uniting our strength in a great united labor movement, we will be able to help our country, help the poor people of the world, combat Communism, and be in a position to express the great American ideal of democracy which needs to be resounded throughout the world." . . .

"There is a mistaken idea that the Congress of Industrial Organizations is the parent of the United Steelworkers of America. It is not. It is the servant of the United Steelworkers just as it is the servant of other affiliates.

"The believers in pan-unionism, however, would like to subvert the fundamental philosophy of the CIO and make us all servants of one powerful master, whoever that master might be. The very idea is wrong that we Steelworkers are the servants of any group, that we can be pushed around by this man or by that man or by a dozen men.

"These disciples of pan-unionism would like to step upon this platform and tell us what to do or say or how to spend our money," Pres. McDonald asserted. "Let me say this to you: They can't do that to the United Steelworkers. Affiliated with? Yes! Owned by? No!"

* * *

In the field of municipal government there has been a strong tendency for the powerful central metropolis to absorb and to destroy the identity of surrounding small towns. To illustrate how responsible small-scale democ-

racy may protect itself in such case without avoiding its responsibilities we reproduce the gist of an article on the subject from *Community Service News*.

In the field of education, where some of the departments of education have undertaken to deny self-direction to local communities and to assume all responsibility for public school education, a technique is developing for the preservation of responsible local autonomy. A discussion of that subject at this year's National Conference on Rural Education is included.

In industry the small independent unit suffers from lack of ability to afford the many special services of great corporations. The manner in which this problem was brilliantly solved in Finland is retold from an article in *Community Service News* of several years ago.

These articles describe cases of a general process which is emerging. The list might be extended. Leagues of American municipalities are organized to protect the autonomy and to promote the interests of cities; the Independent Grocers Alliance (I.G.A. Stores) provides service to nearly 10,000 independently owned food stores, enabling them to secure many of the advantages of large-scale merchandising, including buying, accounting, and advertising.

In several states most of the independent private colleges have voluntarily united to set up state-wide organizations for fund-raising, especially from industries. The funds so raised are distributed among the member colleges, partly on the basis of enrollment and partly by equal division. This form of cooperation helps these independent colleges to compete with state-supported institutions.

In many American cities most autonomous social service organizations unite for raising and distributing funds. In hundreds of communities each civic-purpose organization appoints a representative to a Community Council, where matters of interest to the entire community are dealt with. The member organizations surrender none of their independence in this cooperation.

The "Benelux" countries of Europe have voluntarily associated themselves in their mutual interests. In Venice, Italy, in October 1954 there was held the second annual Assembly of the Council of European Municipalities. At the first session, held at Versailles in 1953, there was adopted a "European Charter of Local Liberties," aiming at the creation or preservation of "autonomous local communities, concrete and to the measure of man, not extraneous to the general social fabric, but harmoniously integrated

in ever larger communities to the level of the national community." In the call for this assembly appears the following quotation:

Federation is the opposite of subjection of the various states and the various regions to a single center. The danger of concentrating the culture in a single point occurs in highly centralized states, where life flows from a single political center outward to the periphery, from above downward. But federation, instead, means freeing the states from those functions which lead to centralization.

—LUIGI EINAUDI, *President of the Italian Republic*

In these instances and in the following contributions we can see the emergence over the world of efforts to preserve responsible autonomy for small-scale democracy through federation. In all areas democracy tends to variety, to the adjustment of organization to local conditions and insight, whereas government by conquest, by control from above and from without, tends to uniformity, compelling local organization and activity to conform to universal arbitrary rule, more or less regardless of local conditions, needs and spirit.

As a small unit of democracy, the small community encounters the same kinds of difficulties as other small-scale autonomous democracies. A community can do much for itself, but to a very considerable degree it will be by pooling efforts for common undertakings that small communities can maintain their attractiveness and adequacy under present conditions. United action for the development of libraries, education, recreation facilities, hospitals and medical services, water supplies, industrial employment, fire protection, public accounting, purchase of public supplies, and various other advantages may help small communities to maintain independence from state and federal bureaucracies and yet to have the advantages of small community living, and nearly all the facilities of large population centers.

While there are many instances of spontaneous cooperation in various parts of the country, no general pattern of action for such united effort has yet emerged. It probably will be desirable in some cases to develop general permissive legislative codes to facilitate the cooperation of small communities in meeting their common needs.

The survival of small-scale self-direction calls for a spirit of independence associated with a spirit of mutual regard and of cooperation. In America the chief handicap to the growth of the practice of association of equals is inadequate development of a spirit of mutual confidence and cooperation. So far as available facilities are concerned, cooperation of small independent industries is more feasible in America than in Finland, yet a considerable development of personal attitude may have to take place before many groups of

small American industries would follow the course of small Finnish industries, as described in this series of articles. Again, so far as facilities are concerned, in the field of community schools the development of democratically administered centers for auxiliary services is entirely feasible. What is chiefly needed is the will and interest to bring it about.

We end this discussion with the statement that the preservation and extension of small-scale democracy, and through it of democracy in general, depend on two factors: first, a desire for independent self-direction; and second, the character, courage, mutual regard and cooperative spirit to maintain such self-direction in free association with others.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS POWER

The emergence in various parts of the world of a general method by which local autonomy is preserved is in reality a re-emergence of elemental democracy. The nature of elemental democracy is indicated in the following extract from an article on "Comparative Community Research" by George P. Murdock of the Yale Cross-Cultural Survey.

The sociologist will do well to remember that for 99 per cent of the approximately one million years that man has inhabited this earth he lived, thrived, and developed without any true government whatsoever, and that as late as one hundred years ago half the peoples of the world—not half the population but half the tribes or nations—still ordered their lives exclusively through informal controls without benefit of political institutions. He should also recognize that political control has one fundamental weakness which man has tried for a hundred centuries to master or correct—with only partial success.

This weakness is the fact that the possession of power inevitably engenders a tendency to employ it for selfish ends, for exploitation rather than service. The holders of political authority, however well intentioned, are removed to some extent from the direct influence of public opinion. They are not, of course, unresponsive to social control, but the controls they respond to are primarily those of their own kind—other office-holders or the particular group to whom they owe their position. A gap opens between rulers and the mass of the governed, and widens with time. Popular needs are neglected. Frustrations accumulate which are only too often met by repressive measures rather than adaptive ones. Eventually there comes an explosion, perhaps a *coup d'état* or perhaps a major revolution, which institutes a change in the ruling personnel. With this the whole process starts all over again. It is for this reason that political history exhibits such a cyclic character, marked by

the rise and fall of dynasties, by alternating conquest and subjugation, by the emergence and liquidation of dominant social classes, by the succession of irreconcilable political philosophies. The spectacular fluctuations in political evolution contrast strikingly with the massive, orderly, progressive processes of change which characterize nearly every other aspect of human culture.

Political democracy strikes me as the cultural invention which comes closest to a solution of this, the toughest problem with which mankind has coped for the last 10,000 years. By providing a means whereby shifting trends in mass needs and public opinion can periodically accomplish changes in governing personnel without resort to revolution, it offers at least a possibility that political evolution can be brought into conformity with the orderly, progressive gradualism by which other aspects of culture change over time. The successful operation of political democracy, however, requires minimal exercise of coercive means and maximal utilization of persuasion and reward. In other words, it involves reintroduction into the regulative system, at a higher level, of those automatic processes for the governing of social behavior which worked so well for so long within the autonomous local community and broke down only when cultural evolution produced larger social aggregates.

If this analysis is correct, the scientific study of informal social control, of the processes of interpersonal interaction in society by which conformity is achieved and collective goals are accepted without the invocation of coercive force, is one of the most important fields of investigation in the entire realm of the social sciences. Perhaps it is even the most important of all.*

VILLAGE ELDERS AND THEIR MODERN COUNTERPARTS

by ARTHUR E. MORGAN

The most effective democracy may be the most informal. It is commonly assumed that informal democratic controls may have been appropriate in primitive small communities, but would be quite impossible on a large scale in the modern world. That is not the case. A comparison of two informal approaches to democracy, one in primitive society, and the other concerning large-scale, modern American industry, will illustrate.

In genuinely primitive society over nearly the whole world there was ■ substantially similar method of dealing with social problems. The unit

*Reproduced from "Feasibility and Implementation of Comparative Community Research," by George P. Murdock, in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 6 (December 1950), pp. 713-720.

of society was the local community. The head of the community, one man or a small group of elders, came into position by general public recognition, rather than by formal election or by force. When an issue required public attention the elders discussed it in the presence of the entire community. Any member of the community might comment on the issue, his opinion being informally weighted in accordance with the respect in which his opinion was held. Consideration would be continued until a general consensus was arrived at. This was democracy in its most elemental form. It never has become wholly obsolete, but persists in many informal activities of society.

In American economic life we see a strikingly similar process emerging on a vast scale. An example is afforded by the American Bell Telephone System. In place of the village elders are the directors and managing staff of the corporation. Around them are the members of the telephone community: the vast number of stockholders concerned for dividend income, the bankers and insurance company officials who speak for the financial world, the general employees with attention on wages and working conditions, the technical staff considering status and significant opportunity as well as income, the users of telephone service wanting stability, adequacy and progress in services rendered, the general public, and the local, state and national governments, especially the public service rate-making commissions. Each of these elements makes its comments, its requests and its demands. The elders of the telephone community—the directors and management—cannot ignore any of these voices. Neither can they surrender to any. They must constantly try to reach consensus.

Thus there re-emerges in modern economic life a sort of informal approach to the world-wide, ancient democratic process. This informal approach is as yet nameless, as was the social organization of the primeval community. It is one of the many ways in which society tends constantly to transcend government by conquest and to achieve peace and stability by consensus. Could the elders of a Danish village, sitting on a circle of stone seats around the village ash tree, such as existed there until a century or two ago, or the elders of a West African village, sitting today in a similar circle of stone seats around the village tree and passing on the problems of the village—could these old men observe the directors and management of the Telephone Company judging influences and pressures from all directions, they might feel that the processes were not dissimilar. This informal method of balancing interests and influences which is emerging in American industry may have in it more of the essence of democracy than would any process of formal voting by all the interests concerned.

TRUSTEESHIP OR DICTATORSHIP

by ARTHUR E. MORGAN

The work of the world must go on. It must be done by those who can do it. No doctrine, such as that of democracy, can be allowed to paralyze the essential activities of life.

Why are a few men masters and most men servants? In my 'teens I sometimes worked as a common laborer in labor gangs, loading rock, threshing wheat or lumbering, and I have lived with labor gangs. One of my commonest experiences of those times was having to listen from morning to night, day after day, to monotonous talk of sex, on the lowest possible level. Only occasionally did the conversation rise to the level of a prize fight or to that of local news. When men talked of their hopes and plans, these were on the level of their conversation. Scarcely ever was there a hint of aspiration or of purpose or of effort for mastery of circumstance. Their temper was that of irresponsible serfs who made no effort toward the mastery of life. Recently I mentioned these experiences to two men, one from Western Europe and the other from the Far East. Each said that their own experiences at home had been similar. In many communities, in many labor unions, there is an unresponsive mass of inertia, which we see particularly at election time, when less than half the citizens vote.

Such experiences were only a part of my early working life. In other cases I worked with young men of self-respecting mind who thought, inquired, exercised self-control, and endeavored to plan their future. So far as I have been able to follow their careers, most of these men have gradually found their way into work of some responsibility.

These differences of attitude, I have come to believe, are more cultural than genetic. Family and neighborhood background and early associations were commonly more responsible than was inborn limitation. Yet, whatever the cause, a considerable part of humanity has failed to achieve those qualities of self-mastery and purposefulness which are necessary for effective self-direction. Such men generally find or are found by masters who use them and rule them.

Even where attitudes are equally good or bad, differences of physical or mental vigor or other inborn endowment, differences in inherited economic or social status, or differences in favorable or unfavorable circumstance, often determine whether a person will be in a position of independence, or of equality, or of authority, or working under orders. Thus authority and subservience result from endless variations of inborn quality, social

tradition, privileged or favored circumstance, or what seems to be sheer chance.

One of the aims of a good society is to equalize outward circumstance and to provide opportunity for personal development so that each person shall have a role to play that is justified by his inherent quality. Yet such development of our society is a slow, gradual process, and in the meantime life must go on.

Under present conditions most men can live better when working for or in association with others than when working for themselves. Some undertakings call for such great or such special ability that very many men must work under the direction of one or a very few. Sometimes a man of great and unique genius creates and directs an important undertaking which, but for his own ability and purposefulness, never would have come into being. Where there is not the character necessary for free association under the direction of such men, or where such men have a will to personal power, the relationship of master and servant is found, whether in public or in private affairs.

Any concept of democracy, or of other equalitarianism, which ignores great differences in competence or purposefulness, is in that degree false, and may be a hindrance rather than a help to human progress. Yet those realities do not vitiate the democratic ideal, which is to assure to every individual the highest degree of self-determination for which he can be responsible and, where group action is necessary, to lodge the initiation and responsibility for such action in groups of free and equal men as close as possible to those primarily affected. Moreover, it should always be the democratic aim to encourage increase of the capacity for responsible self-direction, and never to try to maintain a degree of control over others which is not necessary in the interest of over-all effectiveness of living. And here we come to the contrast between trusteeship and dictatorship.

In the early days of the industrial revolution newly-rich industrialists looked about them for patterns of success, and imitated the dominant personalities of the feudal system. During the feudal period whole provinces were bought, sold, traded, or given as marriage portions, being treated as private personal possessions. The common people were considered as of a lower order of humanity. Not only did these conditions exist, but feudal lords and barons tried to perpetuate them. So far as possible peasant and serf were purposely held in ignorance, with restricted human rights and without ownership of real property.

Successful early industrialists followed this general pattern, though with modifications. The owner lived in a palace home on the hill; his employees

were huddled in crowded tenements about the ugly factory buildings. The greatest criticism of this regime was not the condition at any one time, but the attitude of treating it as a permanent status, and where possible of preventing any increase of participation in industry on the part of the workers. Such participation has been won by the labor union movement, in the earlier period over the stubborn opposition of those in ownership and control of industry.

Today, as a century or two ago, the matter of primary importance to industry, whether privately or publicly owned, is not the relative position of ownership or management on the one hand, and of labor and the consumers on the other, but the attitude of ownership or management toward the economic and social order. Does there exist the attitude of dictatorship on the part of those in power with the greatest possible restriction of participation by the working force and the consuming public; or is there a spirit of trusteeship, with a policy of encouraging the increase of responsible participation and capacity for participation by employees and the public? Among employees there is a similar division of attitude. In some cases there is a spirit of trying to get as much as possible for as little productive work as possible, with little or no sense of responsibility to employer or public, and with little or no effort to develop personal mastery or social responsibility. In other cases there is disciplined competence and loyalty, with effort to develop capacity for greater responsibility.

One sees all kinds of relations and cross-currents in industry. We have observed in Western Europe an able employer trying unselfishly and sincerely to increase the participation of his employees in ownership and benefits in a profitable and growing industry, with the aim that they should come to own it all, while the workers showed little initiative or interest except pleasure at holding jobs where they were treated better than in other firms. On the other hand we have seen loyal, responsible and competent workers who had served a great corporation until past time for learning a new calling, and who were given no more participation in ownership or policy-making than the least competent and least interested worker. We understand that some chain store companies regularly move their managers from town to town so that they will never get a foothold in a community, and therefore will be more dependent on their employer. The ideal course is for employers who have a spirit and policy of maximum feasible participation and of trusteeship to secure as employees those men and women who have best developed competence, self-discipline and loyalty; and for those employees who lack loyalty and desire for personal development to work for those employers who are essentially dictators in not wanting to encourage development and participation by employees.

The chief issue, we repeat, is not where the parties stand at present, but whether or not there exists on the part of management a sustained desire and purpose to encourage increase of self-mastery, self-reliance and desire and capacity for participation in ownership and policy-making on the part of the personnel; or whether there is desire to maintain as tight and limited control as possible. In most industries there are capacities for possible participation in ownership and policy-making which might well have fuller recognition. Nearly always there are capacities for further growth in competence, interest and responsibility which might be encouraged. The attitude of trusteeship is that of holding power over others only temporarily, until competence and responsibility for self-direction can be encouraged and developed.

Such attitude of trusteeship may seem strange in the present temper of "private" industry, when great industrial corporations are bought and sold with no thought of considering the opinions of the employees. The situation is much the same as with provinces in Europe a few centuries ago, when provinces were sold and traded with no thought of considering the wishes of the populations involved. The idea of democracy or of trusteeship has not very greatly penetrated private industry, though it is steadily and vigorously growing. If it can come through steady recognition and development of actual capacity for participation in ownership and policy-making, transition to industrial democracy can be gradual, peaceful, and promotive of economic efficiency.

Men are largely made by their experiences. Few experiences are more nearly universal or more intimate and important than that of making a living. If one's economic life is in an undemocratic economic world, then his spirit of democracy will not grow, and in spirit he will be either a serf or a rebel. One's pattern tends to unity. If in the major experiences of life, in one's religion and in making a living, he is in an undemocratic or antidemocratic world, then he will not long be democratic in his political life and thought.

The attitude of trusteeship accords with the spirit of democracy, and is sound and valid. We have illustrated it in the field of industry. It is equally valid in education. All control of education from the center should be limited to that which is at present necessary *in particular cases*. Wherever there is capacity for self-direction it should be recognized. Where it is not well developed it should be encouraged, exercised and informed. Educational administration has committed great sins against democracy in the name of democracy in routinely removing educational responsibility from local school systems, regardless of the quality of local administration.

The same need for a spirit of trusteeship exists in religion. The aim of religious growth should be the self-governing responsibility of individuals

united in voluntary organizations for the common good. No dictatorship which tries to prevent such growth toward religious autonomy is valid, though it may claim to have a charter for sole spiritual dictatorship conferred by the creator of the universe. It is no accident that among the many nations dominated by an authoritarian religious hierarchy, scarcely any has achieved stable democracy and social well-being. On the other hand, in America the very large number of autonomous local religious congregations have been ■ training ground for democracy.

The spirit of trusteeship is located now here, now there. There can be no arbitrary rule for finding it. The Magna Carta emerged from the efforts of a lower order of power, the barons, to control the arbitrary power of the king. In America a somewhat different location of trusteeship has existed. The thirteen original states were in a way offshoots of English government, and carried over from the old world the concept of the state as an irresponsible power, accustomed to act arbitrarily, to bestow unearned favors, and quite commonly the refuge of privilege. That concept of the state carried over to America, and in some degree has persisted in the extension of states across our country.

Our national government, on the other hand, was in large degree a new creation by men seeking a good way of life free from arbitrary privilege, and it breathed a spirit of democracy and trusteeship.

That spirit has in large degree continued to the present. The western states, if left to themselves, seem inclined to parcel out the national resources of forest, grazing lands and water power to special private interests. The national government has tended to prevent this, though under great pressure from the states involved. "Off-shore oil," successfully fought for by the states, may go to enrich private operators. The elimination of race segregation is largely a national, rather than a state, achievement. The U.S. Office of Education has been markedly more progressive and democratic than many or most of the state departments of education. Badly as the American Indian has been treated by our national government, his partial protection has been by that government, commonly against pressure from the states directly concerned. The land and the oil of the Indians have been sweet morsels, craved by private interests which could get them more easily from the states than from the national government. The states would ruthlessly dismember the tribes and their ancestral land holdings, and would have turned over the lands to private development.

Even in such cases, however, the more democratic action of the national government only gave effect to movements that had become widespread and strong among the people of America. When our antiquated state governments have been modernized, perhaps along the lines of the emerging

council-manager governments of cities and counties, their rightful place in the order of government may be achieved.

In the fields of private industry and commerce, also, some of our great national corporations show higher regard for human values than do many small, personally owned firms. The latter may have quite directly inherited the feudal tradition of industry, whereas some large corporations, with personnel directors and other officers professionally trained in the American atmosphere, are sensitive to human values and, as mentioned elsewhere, have become skilled at seeking consensus among many interests.

The object of this discussion is to indicate that while the general principle of decentralization of function and authority is sound, there are limits to its applicability in many specific cases, and the general principle should not blind us to realities. We will find the issues of democracy and trusteeship running through the relations of parents and children, of teachers and pupils, of officials and citizens.

The ideal of democracy is the responsible self-direction of the individual in personal matters, and, where others are involved, management of affairs through self-governing associations, always on as small a scale, and as close to the people involved as is consistent with the rights and welfare of those affected. Always the operation of this principle should be in accord with realities, and not by abstract theory. In line with this general policy, responsible individuals will be encouraged to become competent and to organize for the administration of local affairs, or of the parts of larger undertakings that are within their range of competence. Groups of local organizations will federate for mutual service, without surrendering local autonomy for local affairs; and so on to the highest level of democratic federation.

Always, wherever possible, the authority at the higher level will encourage self-reliance and self-direction for smaller units. Wherever there is effort to arbitrarily increase power at the top and to reduce that at the bottom we have, not trusteeship but dictatorship.

There is no conflict between the attitude of democracy and trusteeship on the one hand and administrative competence on the other. For instance, the council-manager form of city government eliminates many elective offices and centralizes responsibility, yet maintains the spirit of democracy and of trusteeship. Such regional administrations as that of the Toronto area, described elsewhere in these articles, can combine all these values.

E PLURIBUS UNUM: A NEW POLICY FOR SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES*

by GRISCOM MORGAN

There has long been a tendency on the part of the metropolis to seek to annex all contiguous communities, and to destroy their autonomy, integrity and very existence, along with their community service organizations. These suburban communities, on the other hand, often have provoked such action by trying to escape the burden of taxation for public utilities and services required by the central city, though their own income arises from their proximity to the city, and from the labor and services of people who work in the big city. Also there has been refusal to face the fact that the needs and resources of different suburbs vary greatly. Well-to-do city business and professional men maintain their residences in deluxe, restricted suburbs, with abundant resources for schools, streets, parks and amenities, while the poorer of the suburbs, and the unincorporated "suburban sprawl" which extends across the countryside, which house industrial workers and servants, are desperately in need of services and utilities. By such means wealthy suburbs may seek immunity from taxation and responsibility.

There is beginning to emerge in the United States and Canada a pattern of metropolitan organization which may forecast a new and better day for our great cities and their suburbs. Instead of the "megapolis" which devours men and communities in its insatiable maw, producing a great saurian mass with too little central brain for its management, we may be coming to a day when a metropolitan area will be, not a sodden political and social mass, but a community of communities, each one alive and wholesome in its own right, yet with responsible coordination like that of a well trained orchestra. This development in America is largely independent of, yet quite similar to a trend in Europe. Perhaps similar needs are suggesting similar remedies.

Recently a distinguished visiting European, Professor Michel Mouskhely of the University of Strasburg, described the dominant present trend of European social and political thought to be away from both totalitarian central government and from "political atomism"; and toward a general adoption of "federalism." By that term he means a decentralization of government for local and regional purposes, with centralized power retained, and increased where necessary, only for those elements of the common life that are beyond effective local administration. This is a reversal of the trend

*Reprinted from *Community Service News*, Vol. XII, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1954).

in Europe during the past few centuries. Europe is coming to this point of view after bitter experience with extreme centralization.

In America, notwithstanding loud voices to the contrary, the trend to centralize continues. This has been especially true in the consolidation of metropolitan cities and their suburban areas. Only now is selective decentralization coming to be a clearly recognized possibility, for there has now appeared on the American continent an actual case on a metropolitan scale of the application of this theory of "federalism."

How can small towns and villages near metropolitan cities maintain their community existence, and still develop a responsible organic relation to the expanding metropolis? And how can the central city reduce its problems to manageable dimensions, and get the help from the suburbs which it needs in meeting common problems? Need for a solution to this problem becomes increasingly acute. About a quarter of America's population lives within the suburban areas surrounding its one hundred and seventy major cities. So great has been the migration to these suburban areas both from metropolitan cities and from the hinterlands, that these suburbs had half of the population increase of the country between 1940 and 1950. Among the major reasons for this migration to the suburbs is the desire for community living in place of the anonymity and pressure of the huge metropolis, and the impoverishment of hinterland areas by metropolitan economic centralization, making it necessary for people from farm, village and town to come into the vicinity of the metropolis to find market for their labor and produce, and to find the cultural advantages that have tended to migrate cityward along with the nation's wealth.

The case is clear that both individually and as communities the great majority of suburbanites desire to maintain their separate community identity. Many such a community and well governed suburb does not seek to escape from responsibility to the metropolis, though it greatly desires to maintain responsibility for its own affairs, and for its small community values. In this situation it resists annexation by the metropolitan center.

As a rule the metropolitan center achieved its status in the first place by the process of annexation of surrounding communities, a gentle form of conquest. Up to the present this has been the only pattern of metropolitan enlargement that is well established. [Where areas adjoining a city are developed with the intent that they shall be extensions of the city, of course annexation is normal and proper.]

Central cities and the surrounding towns and villages are today in a predicament similar to that of the city-states of a bygone era when the strongest power in an area conquered and incorporated into itself nearby city-states, countries and provinces, which generally resisted the loss of their

identity. Assuming that a process of nation-building was necessary, was it necessary to destroy the smaller and weaker units? Among nations, the United States and Switzerland stand out as exceptions to the general rule of growth by conquest. They are federations of equal states, not dominant states that have grown dominant by devouring their neighbors. The affairs of cities today form a parallel with those of the city nation-states of the past; they too have the alternatives of conquest or federation. Even with regard to population, our metropolitan areas today are at least as great as the populations of most states a few centuries ago when national consolidation was getting under way.

As long as the metropolis continues to dominate and draw the life blood of purchasing power and wealth from hinterland areas, so long will the metropolis be a focal point of trouble. But much can be done to alleviate the condition, giving city-employed people some of the community life and responsibility they crave as conditions for humane living and democratic responsibility. Moreover, the very process of modifying governmental organization to take smaller community needs into consideration can do much to improve government and administration of metropolitan affairs. It may even set a pattern for progressive intercommunity cooperation in other areas away from metropolitan centers.

* * *

The entire metropolis—central city and suburbs—is an organic whole. Each part is dependent upon the others. Sometimes the central city is smaller than the combined suburbs, sometimes much larger. The intimate community of leading bankers, industrialists and merchants that dominate the city and its government may live largely beyond the city limits, where they seek to give their families good environment in communities over which they have intimate control and in which they participate. The skilled labor, professional and white-collar groups that flee from the central city into other suburban surroundings are obviously integral parts of the metropolis, as are the industries. The inner slum and the outer fringe areas of more indigent people are also parts of the larger whole.

The total metropolis seldom has had legal and governmental existence. It is a balkan congeries of conflicting, overlapping and interdependent governmental entities, each consciously concerned with itself, none admitting concern with the whole. As the self-interest of the central city leads it to seek to annex and totally absorb the suburbs that hem it in, it and its functionaries—city planners, administrators, social service and other officials—think of the centralized organization of the central city as assuming ever wider areas of responsibility. The suburbs, on the other hand, while jealously

guarding their independence, have assumed little responsibility and express little concern for the problems of other suburbs or of the metropolis as a whole.

* * *

With this background of conflict of city and suburbs, there have recently been some interesting and significant efforts to deal with the problems of our cities, in writing as well as in actual organization. It is interesting that a variety of unrelated efforts in different places have independently led to common conclusions with regard to the basic over-all problem.

The major contribution to the subject is a section by Victor Jones in the important Urban Redevelopment study directed by Coleman Woodbury, whose reports, *Urban Redevelopment* and *The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment* (a number of books by different authors under one cover), were published last year. Another study is a little book written by an authority in the field, Miles Colean, for the Twentieth Century Fund. A third study is yet more impressive because the local findings have resulted in actual accomplishment. This is the governmental organization of metropolitan Toronto, the outgrowth of a study by the Ontario Municipal Board, reported in *Decisions and Recommendations* of the Board, January 20, 1953. There are a number of other studies, such as Copenhagen's use of the new Danish Urban Development Act, and the report on Rotterdam, Holland, *The Future of the City, the City of the Future*.

* * *

The central idea of all these efforts is the need for a supermetropolitan agency to represent the interests and serve the requirements of the entire metropolitan area. At the same time, each finds that consolidation of governmental organization of the entire area with the government of the central city is either impossible, harmful, or, in the case of Rotterdam, a process that should be reversed.

Toronto, like many metropolitan cities, had made application to the Ontario Municipal Board for the powers to annex and completely dissolve thirteen local municipal governments in a large suburban area surrounding it. Eleven of the suburbs joined in opposing this application. The twelfth made application for the amalgamation of *some* governmental services in the suburban area. The central city had 675,000 inhabitants, the suburbs had 350,000.

All parties in the Toronto issue prepared excellent evidence to support their claims. Seemingly it was an either-or proposition between two parties each of which had a strong case to make. And in making their cases they made the typical case of most American cities and suburban areas: either

completely absorb the suburbs in a single city government, or else leave things as they were. But unlike the states in the United States, the Canadian Province of Ontario had a board set up to serve the best interests of municipalities rather than only as a legal court to decide for one or another of two parties. Interestingly, such a state function is strongly urged by Victor Jones in his section of the Urban Redevelopment study.

So the Ontario Municipal Board took the matter in hand. It carefully reviewed the extensive evidence put forward by the city of Toronto, and that presented by the suburbs. It found both arguments sound, but decided that neither had got to the heart of the matter. The suburbs had discovered no legal grounds for proposing an answer to the problem of the metropolis—whose necessary existence they recognized—so they concentrated on marshalling evidence against the annexation that would put them out of existence. The Ontario Municipal Board sought an answer to the problem that would maintain the values of both central city and suburbs, and which would solve the metropolitan problem.

Among the suburbs of Toronto there are cities with population as great as eighty thousand and towns as small as five thousand. Each city had its own deep-rooted tradition, practices and organization that, in case of merger with the larger city, would be violated or destroyed. Even if it were desirable to have but one city government supersede all of them, the task would be formidable. The board found strong evidence that per capita "costs in general tend to increase with the size of the municipality [with] . . . an almost endless list of desirable but unnecessary expenditures regardless of its true financial position."

More important, the Ontario Municipal Board found "very serious objection to . . . the proposed concentration of all municipal duties and responsibilities in a single all-powerful Council which would be expected to deal wisely and adequately with both local and metropolitan problems. . . ." The report continued:

Local government involving direct and personal contacts between the electors and the elected representatives . . . is considered to be the right and privilege of local taxpayers and the primary function of local councils and elected bodies. . . . The proposal of the city assumes that a single city council can cope with all the local, sectional and regional problems of the present local governments in an area of more than two hundred and forty square miles and a present population of well over a million persons. The board cannot accept this fundamental assumption. On the contrary, it is convinced that one essential of a sound metropolitan government for the Toronto area must be the separation of local and metropolitan municipal functions and duties.

A fourth serious objection to the city's proposal has been . . . grave doubt whether the need for reform of local government in this area justifies and requires the complete dissolution of the existing municipal institution and the creation of a form of government bitterly opposed by eleven of the thirteen local municipalities concerned. . . . Nor can the board in any way agree with the somewhat cynical view that the appointed and elected officials of the local municipalities who . . . appeared before the board to explain carefully and intelligently their views on this very controversial issue. . . . were after all merely protecting their own positions. . . . In brief, they could not bring themselves to believe that the form of metropolitan government desired by the city could be properly called a local government. To them the complete loss of their local autonomy meant domination by the central city . . . regardless of any system of representation by population or any proposed division of the proposed new city into wards.

Such were the findings of the Ontario board with regard to Toronto's request to swallow up a large suburban area. The board expressed itself as also convinced that the reluctance of suburbs to be annexed arose from "a conscious or unconscious conviction of the importance of preserving a place for real local government, and that few, if any, of the opponents of amalgamation are prepared to defend the present system as a suitable form of government in a metropolitan area." In other words, whereas the drive to annex suburbs is generally met with most severe resistance, a sound alternative metropolitan government that would preserve the local community might be welcomed by the suburbs.

The Ontario Board report goes on to suggest that the most promising approach to a solution of this question lies in a "dual system of government, an acceptance of the idea that the establishment of a strong central authority is the best method of dealing with vital problems affecting the entire area, and a conviction that the retention of local government for local purposes is not only desirable but necessary."

The report of the Ontario Municipal Board is a document worth reading and study in full. The particular way in which the subsequent federation of Metropolitan Toronto put those principles into practice may or may not be as good as could have been provided, but many aspects are sociologically sound and well conceived. For, example, there is a local school board in each of the thirteen municipalities, with a metropolitan school board to correlate the educational facilities in the metropolitan area and through the metropolitan corporation to finance the local schools up to a minimum standard. The metropolis as a whole has powers of assessment for taxation, supplies water and sewage mains and main thoroughfares to the local municipalities, has responsibility for part of the health and welfare, for justice, housing, redevelopment, planning, and for over-all budgeting. The Metropolitan

Council has twelve representatives from the suburban governments and twelve from the central city.

The work of the Ontario Municipal Board has been criticized for failing to take into account in its study the prevailing literature and past experience on the subject. From this standpoint it is significant that two outstanding authorities who have recently surveyed the field, Victor Jones and Miles Colean, come to similar conclusions. Victor Jones, in his section, "Local Government in Metropolitan Areas" in *The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment*, writes: "People identified with the central city and those identified with the suburbs are justified by their interests, *as they have defined them*, in fearing each other. What is needed is to place these interests into the larger community context so that the periphery is concerned with the downtown, and the city is concerned with the fringe. This can only be done by bringing the various interests—the dichotomy of suburbs vs. central city is too simple to describe them—into a working relationship with each other. . . . The formal organization of such relationships through governmental action is the problem we are concerned with in this study."

Mr. Jones quotes a succinct statement of the metropolitan problem by Thomas Reed: "A metropolis is not an assemblage of individuals so much as a collection of communities into which individuals are already assembled." Mr. Jones goes on to say:

The one clear lesson we all should have learned by now from the many attempts in this country and abroad to establish metropolitan governments is that the local units of government are tough organizations with many political and legal protections against annihilation or absorption by another government.

This alone would lead us to search for a form of metropolitan government that will preserve the identity of existing units of government.

Like the Ontario municipal board, Victor Jones surveys the different ways in which suburbs, central city and county may achieve an effective working relationship with each other in the setting of the whole metropolis. He points out that suburbs have shown little interest in the broader metropolitan problem, and that "urban redevelopers are principally concerned with . . . the conservation of the city's physical plant from obsolescence. . . . If we leave it to the professional city planner to deal with these [wider] relationships, we will fail to understand our own problems and we will make the task of the planning agency difficult if not impossible."

Like the Ontario board, Mr. Jones claims that we must not regard the alternatives as simply the anarchy of "the present dispersal of local government . . . in hundreds of municipalities, counties and special districts, or

their replacement with a single neat and tidy government." Various stop-gap or partial solutions of the problem are reviewed, such as metropolitan planning without governmental authority, inter-community arrangements for services, special districts, etc. Mr. Jones concludes that some form of larger government needs to be organized that would integrate the parts of the metropolis into a working whole without destroying or disintegrating the wholesome local governmental and community life of the suburban communities. While "nothing should be done to discourage inter-governmental arrangements, . . . they will not serve in place of more comprehensive schemes." Likewise, "disembodied planning" for the metropolitan area "is not a substitute for government."

The county might suitably serve for the governmental unit of the metropolitan area, but for a number of serious drawbacks. The whole tradition and establishment of the county is unsuited to this purpose, and its area generally does not conform to that of the metropolis. "One of the principal impediments to the transformation of the county into a metropolitan government is the legal concept of the county as an administrative subdivision of the state created almost exclusively with a view to the policy of the state at large." If it is to serve as the unit of metropolitan government the county would have to be drastically altered, a difficult task in view of the political power of rural county machines in the state legislature.

In conclusion Mr. Jones asserts that only a government with metropolitan-area-wide "jurisdiction can plan and provide the services, physical facilities, guidance, and controls necessary." He states:

Our metropolitan communities are growing so large that we can no longer content ourselves with attempting to bring the whole area under one all-purpose general local government organized according to a pattern suitable for government of a nineteenth-century village.

I doubt that any proposal has much chance of success unless it is based on the federal principle of allocating metropolitan functions to a metropolitan government and leaving other functions to less-than-metropolitan governments. . . . Irresponsible local government fragmented among a multitude of municipalities, counties, and special districts unable to meet the problems of metropolitan life, frustrates the citizen and leaves him hopeless. The other extreme of a giant all-purpose metropolitan municipality would certainly be too cumbersome for any ordinary group of citizens to influence.

The Netherlands study of Rotterdam's metropolitan problem, *The Future of the City, the City of the Future*, goes even further than the Ontario and U.S. studies in suggesting that different quarters or parts even of the central city that have inborn traditions and customs and a feeling of belong-

ing together should be made partly autonomous, especially in cultural organization.

Miles Colean's attractive illustrated book, *Renewing Our Cities*, briefly covers some of the same ground in its 181 pages as the urban redevelopment volume of 764 pages, except that he gives little consideration to small community values and more underlying considerations. His conclusion is nearly identical to that of Victor Jones:

All questions head up to the need for some method of integrating the physical structure and political functions of the metropolitan area.

In most places little is to be expected from the ordinary processes of annexation. . . . Probably the best promise of success would come from some form of federation which would centralize control over functions of area-wide concern, at the same time leaving the original units some measure of jurisdiction over plainly local matters.

This problem of uniting communities into an area federation is of importance to rural hinterland communities as well as to metropolitan suburbs. The principle, "united we stand, divided we fall," applies to communities of all sizes. For example, the relatively small cities and towns that are associated with each other in Southern Illinois, Inc., a hinterland of Chicago and St. Louis, are making significant headway in consequence of their united endeavor. The Upper Winooski Valley Development Association in Vermont is one of many less formal associations.

The general principle of regional governmental organizations of smaller towns was given outstanding expression by Lewis Mumford in an article, "Regional Planning and the Small Town," reprinted in the September-October, 1950, *Community Service News*. Mumford envisions a regional federation of towns that will together achieve the advantages of metropolitan living without any one of them growing too large and sprawling over the landscape and destroying its natural environment. To achieve such a control and direction of growth requires authority over and beyond each local community.

The same principle is needed in dealing with the problems of school consolidation. Huge consolidations of schools, and county and state domination of school districts, are not the only answers to the need for central services and administration. Thus in many places the principle needs to be applied: E Pluribus Unum.

CONSOLIDATION: BARRIER TO DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS*

by MAURICE F. SEAY

If the extension of a person's horizon involves a lessening of his interest and responsibility in the community of which home is a part, he is just as unbalanced as is the man who is justly referred to as an isolationist. Some of the unfortunate results of premature horizon-extending are now being recognized. One manifestation of this recognition is the new interest in the concept of the community school. The community school is seen as the institution which can revitalize community life and thus counterbalance the trend toward state and national and world orientation. . . .

The inclusion of local-mindedness along with state-, regional-, national-, and world-mindedness is an important consideration in any discussion of school consolidation. Because I believe so strongly that America needs community schools, I urge that all school consolidations be evaluated by this criterion: attendance districts should be consolidated only when the enlarged district does not become a barrier to the development of a community school. . . .

The community school does not assume, of course, that it provides all the educational services for all age levels, but it seeks to make its contribution to the total educational program of the community, recognizing that many other agencies have legitimate educational aims. . . .

A fifth element of the community-school concept is the use that the school makes of the community. The interdependence of the school and the community implies not only that the school is capable of contributing to the solution of the community's problems but that the school should be a beneficiary of the community's cultural and productive resources. This is an old-fashioned two-way street—the school serves the community and the community serves the school. . . .

The consolidation of two or more attendance units into one large attendance unit may create a situation which definitely thwarts the development of a community school. Such reorganization may lead to the development of a school with a very large enrollment but with no sense of community belonging, a school with great emphasis upon subject matter but with

*From an article in *Educational Leadership*, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, May 1953. Reprinted by permission.

no consciousness of the relation of the subject matter to real problems, a school with extensive diversification in program but with little concern for general education, a school with high idealism with respect to national and international goals but with a record of achieving only superficial understandings since it has no local community to which it can relate the larger geographic concepts, a school that is emotional over the role of community life but actually sees this role as a nostalgic exercise.

To promote the development of community schools, a consolidation program should apply, along with other criteria not discussed in this article, ■ standard which would assure a local community for each school. The meaning of the term "local community," of course, would be defined by the school or school system involved. Since the community school bases its program upon real problems of the community, many difficulties would arise if the school were attempting to serve two or more local communities. Though located adjacent to each other, communities are different; their resources and their needs are different. . . .

Advocates of school consolidation have frequently rested their case upon the fact that a large school can offer a greatly diversified program. Today this is not so convincing an argument as it used to be, for we now believe that greater emphasis should be placed upon general education for all and that there should be less specialization until completion of secondary education. Many large schools are attempting to regain the advantage of smaller units by organizing on the "campus plan" and by emphasizing core programs and common learnings.

. . . Because of space limitations, I am here emphasizing only the one thesis: attendance districts should be consolidated only when the enlarged district does not become a barrier to the development of a community school.

Yes, we want new horizons; we want to develop understandings of national and world problems. But we also want to give our students an understanding of community problems. Fortunately we have discovered that we can most effectively accomplish all these goals by developing community schools. Let us not allow overenthusiasm for school consolidation to deprive us of the power for revitalizing our communities that is inherent in the community school.

AFFILIATION OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS FOR COMMON SERVICES*

by GRISCOM MORGAN

The 1954 *Yearbook* of the Department of Rural Education of the NEA reports on a very significant educational development under the title, "The Community School and the Intermediate Unit." It describes a growing movement to take the rural school back to the social setting of the child's life and education, from which the school has been progressively withdrawn for several decades. It represents the discovery that formal education can have the advantages of modern administration and of an enriched curriculum of varied services without losing local community autonomy, initiative and responsibility.

Instead of aiming to provide every school with every kind of needed service, which is possible only with massive consolidation, the intermediate unit program would provide for a group of local school systems a central pool of personnel and material to supply auxiliary services as they are needed. By this means small community school systems can have those advantages which otherwise would be available only to the large systems, maintaining the small school advantages that large schools rarely have. In various parts of the country the intermediate unit has been developed to a point of demonstrating its effectiveness.

Huge centralized administration or attendance units in rural education can no longer be justified. Local communities, by cooperating with others similarly situated to secure auxiliary services, may be sounder and more able to adjust to change and improvement, than either isolated small community schools, or large, centralized organizations which destroy local autonomy. This advance in educational thinking brings us back to some fundamental conditions of human growth and development and to the main stream of American educational tradition.

* * *

Present-day society greatly needs to discover the small, intimate community. Up to a century ago more than ninety per cent of all men lived in small communities, as more than seventy-five per cent still do. Through the course of history cities have been little more than foam on the human ocean, to

*An address given at the National Conference on Rural Education, Washington, D.C., October 4-6, 1954. Reprinted from the *Proceedings* of the Conference by permission of the Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association.

float for a time, and then to disappear. Because history has been written in cities, we have not realized how small a part of humanity has lived in them, or the extent to which human stability and continuity have been based on the small community life of the world.

Only during the past seventy-five years, with the profound world revolution in living brought on by modern technology, have sociologists begun to realize that this ancient institution is vital to human existence, and that it is in danger. Over most of the world the roots of community life are old and deep, and their destruction is powerfully resisted. In America the roots of community are less secure, and technology and urbanization threaten its very existence. Yet small community life is still fundamental to the continuity of our culture. It is therefore highly important that America shall discover the significance of the small community.

Each of us has his own idea of what constitutes a community. A ten-year study by the Institute of Human Relations at Yale, of societies over the world from ancient times to the present* arrived at the conclusion that there are only two characteristics universally present in all human societies, ancient or modern. These are the family and the small, intimate community. It is doubtful whether anywhere in history we have a record of a civilization long surviving the disappearance of its small community life.

If we were to discover a society of men who had learned to dispense with stomach or liver, we would have valuable information to guide our surgeons. The nearly universal experience that the stomach is a necessary organ leads surgeons to refrain from removing it, except as a last resort. In our dealings with human society we have the evidence of nearly all of society and of nearly all of history as to the fundamental importance of the small community. In adjusting to modern technology and culture we are not at liberty to assume that the day of the small community is past, or that its functions can with impunity be taken away.

No organ or part of the human body can continue sound and normal if it is not used; if it does not perform its peculiar work. As a rule, no other organ can perform its work as well. The same is true of the small community in the whole of human society. It cannot survive if its natural activities are taken away from it; and no other element of society can do its work as well.

The community values which all people require for wholesome living are universal values. They are not limited to rural areas, nor to any nation. They develop in a great variety of forms. Just as the great family of mammals, in order to meet varying conditions or possibilities, has evolved into

*George P. Murdock, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 6 (December 1950), "Comparative Community Research."

such diverse types as mice, giraffes, bats, whales and human beings, all without the sacrifice of the basic structure and function of mammals, so the intimate small communities of men, regardless of the greatly varied circumstances to which they are adjusted, all have in common very definite conditions for human survival.

The first universal need which is supplied by a good small community is for a sense of security and solidarity. This is provided nowhere else so well as in a family and a small community where there is intimate acquaintance, mutual trust, understanding, love, sympathy and mutual endeavor, and a mutual sharing of burdens in time of need. Except in an enduring, intimate, responsible group these relationships cannot send out their delicate roots which must precede hardy growth into the strength of confirmed character. Technology and professional skill do not take the place of the home. Neither do our educational institutions or pediatric or psychiatric services; rather they know and recognize its importance. The family and the small community are at the beginning of the child's outreach and growth toward human society and the universe. The small community extends beyond and around the family. It is the next stage in growth and association toward the wide world, and is essential to the normal development of children, as well as to the maintenance of the spirit of adults.

A universal characteristic of the real human community is limited size. The Yale Cross-Cultural Survey, just referred to, reached the conclusion that intimate community relationships seldom could be maintained in groups of more than about twelve hundred. In general, the more complete the acquaintance and mutual confidence, the smaller the group.

What is the best size for a small community varies with the maturity of the people involved. Children thrive in smaller social groups than do mature men and women. With increasing age the intimate home community is too limited a field for experience in growing up. In many cultures, some time after the fourteenth year boys commonly leave home or go to work. Yet during high school there also is evidence of need for limited size of school and community. A comparative study of high schools of different sizes in the State of Washington revealed significantly less personal acquaintance, friendship, and community relations among high school seniors in large than in small high schools. A study directed by Carl C. Taylor of 114 rural communities over the nation indicated that for the next stage beyond the small primary community, such as would be appropriate for high school units, those having a high group consciousness have trade centers of 1000 to 3500 people.

The second universal need which is supplied by the small community is to insure the development and transmission of that informal social order

upon which all society rests, and without which it cannot exist. Governments, laws and courts may restrain extreme departures from the spirit of orderly and considerate society, but they cannot create it. This order grows in the fiber of people's lives, chiefly through living in social groups intimate enough and whole enough to insure that it becomes established as second nature. No amount of police power, discipline and leadership can keep order and harmony where these qualities are not ingrown.

Good, informal social order cannot grow in too large a social group. Mob action, isolation, delinquency, and personality disorders are characteristic of instability or disappearance of small community relationships. A prominent criminologist declared that community or lack of it is the whole story in regard to delinquency. And Judge Samuel Leibowitz, discussing sex crimes, says:

For example, take Chinatown in the city of New York. It is still a community. Chinatown has the lowest crime rate in the entire city. Why? Because it is still a neighborhood where neighbor knows neighbor.

One of the foremost educators of Holland, who recently was offered the highest educational post in his country, discussing the damage of the Second World War to his country, said the chief harm was not the bombing of Rotterdam nor the cutting of the sea dykes, but the depersonalizing of the young people of Holland. This depersonalization, he said, was because, due to the disturbed conditions, the young people did not have the usual normal and intimate relations with older people, and so the passing on of the informal cultural tradition was greatly interfered with. It is just such breaking of the informal cultural tradition that modern American life tends to bring about, and excessive school consolidation has contributed to that result.

The third universal need which must be supplied chiefly by the small community is the maintenance of that spirit of self-direction, initiative and responsibility which is essential to effective democracy. The community must be self-existing, managing its own local affairs in its own way, as does a mature family. Here, if anywhere, is the training school of democracy. Like the family, the community needs an economy of its own, including a secure place in a larger economy; a tradition of its own; a locale or setting; and it needs religious, educational, political, and recreational functions of its own if it is to be whole and enduring.

Control should be clearly distinguished from assistance, counsel and service. If the necessary things are done to it and for it, but not by it, the community degenerates. Dr. Max Wolff and his staff studied 2000 communities which had betterment projects. In less than a fifth had there been

general community participation. In general, "leaders" had been doing things to and for the community. In nearly every case where there was general community participation the people of the community had worked out for themselves what they wanted to do, and therefore they were interested in doing it. Participation adds interest and tends to increase competence. Local community responsibility, with competent counsel and assistance within reach, is almost always good policy in education. Such participation leads to creative advance.

Today modern technology and centralized management have made it possible to withdraw one after another of the normal functions from the community, and they have been progressively withdrawn, until the normal life of the community is greatly restricted and impoverished. Yet both children and adults have vital need for the community as an area of life in which the intimate group shall have mastery of its own affairs. The gradual destruction of the community, by taking away its natural functions of education, local administration, intimate associations, and occasions for working together for common ends, will have serious effects on national character and destiny. These effects will only be observed as a progressive development, from generation to generation, not immediate in their total impact.

* * *

Not only do children require the small community, but the community requires the children. It is largely the presence of children that creates and preserves community. The people of a community become acquainted with each other through their children more than in any other way. In acting in the interest of their children they become aware of the community. Take the children out of the community for their education and the community commonly dies.

To survive, the community must be cared for and loved for its own sake, as the family or the nation is loved and cared for. It cannot survive and prosper simply as the location of largely unrelated activities and institutions, such as school, church and business. The community is all one. We cannot expect it to support childhood education adequately if it is not involved. The community cannot be educationally progressive if responsibility and attendant enlightenment are not shared in the community, but are the concerns only of school authorities, with tolerance of the interest of individual parents, school board and PTA.

Through most of human existence education of children was a natural result of living in the community. Even with the development of more formal education, it continued to be primarily a family and small community responsibility. When the French school system developed after the Revo-

lution, the totalitarian pattern of thinking engendered there took the child as far as possible away from other associations and made him a creature of the state, controlled from the center. Parental visiting or participation was discouraged. The aim was to make over the mind of the child in accord with the ideas of the state. This totalitarian pattern spread over Europe, and from there invaded America. We do not fully realize the extent to which this scientifically mistaken and socially unwise philosophy has taken hold in the administration of American education.

It has been the specific doctrine of some state departments of education that education is a function of the state, and that local communities have no rights or functions in education except those delegated by the state. In the very practical politics of education this doctrine has been vigorously pressed, even while being publicly denied, with the deliberate intent of taking away power in education from the local communities and vesting it in the state and its departments of education.

Here we have the theory which has been carried over from authoritative regimes from across the ocean—the theory that power and rights are identical. The age-long experience of mankind and the inherent nature of the community reveal that the rights and functions of the community as to community affairs are indigenous in the community by its very nature. The state with its greater power is under obligation to recognize and to protect and maintain those rights. Explicit recognition of this fact would make a great and wholesome change in the atmosphere of community education.

* * *

Today the significance of the small community in education is being rediscovered, and the community is being given recognition in school planning. That process must be carried further. We must build a fuller understanding of the significance of the small community, of its place in a changing world, and of its place in the education of children. The 1954 Rural Education *Yearbook* referred to records a nation-wide reaction against these policies of consolidation. I quote from it to illustrate:

Regardless of the particular services provided, the community is a basic unit for democratic processes and the achievement of social action. The school is an important agency for developing a more effective community life, and *every identifiable community should have a school*. . . . Providing a school in every identifiable community means that there will be many small schools. . . . The school should be an integral part of the community. . . . Community development is impossible without coordination of the main social, educational and economic organizations which are responsible.

The elementary-school attendance units and the secondary school attendance units should be organized around the natural sociological neighborhood and community areas.

Every decision made at the intermediate level must be in keeping with the principle of local community responsibility.

The community school is the most important unit of school operation.

These expressions indicate how great is the change of attitude which is coming over the country with respect to community schools.

Now, with the increasing development of widespread programs of auxiliary services provided to local community schools from central pools—the so-called intermediate units—the typical arbitrary consolidation programs have no further excuse.

Our problem is to determine how the underlying life of the small community is to find expression in a world of large governmental and economic affairs, and of extreme mobility and interrelatedness of people, of population centers and of economics. A small intimate community cannot be a world by itself, any more than can the individual or the family. But each needs and can have its own appropriate degree of independent being, integrated into the larger society. Order upon order of wider relationships, in village, township, county or region, state and nation, as well as special interests and associations, extend beyond the intimate community. Emphasis on any one or more of them should not arbitrarily infringe upon the existence and life of the intimate community.

* * *

The auxiliary service pool, mentioned earlier and referred to in the *Yearbook* as the intermediate unit of educational service, is more than a fortunate educational device; it is an example of a fundamental addition to our social resources. It is a method and principle of organization which is emerging in many parts and phases of the democratic world as necessary for saving the processes and structure of democracy under present and changing world conditions. Isolated democratic units of operation can no longer survive. They must associate or perish. Either they must associate as equals for their own protection and progress, as did the cantons of Switzerland centuries ago, or they will be swallowed up by consolidation and conquest, as were most of the smaller states of Europe, and as community schools have been swallowed up by the centralized education departments in our own country.

Moreover, the auxiliary service pool can and should be more than just an intermediate station between the state department of education and the community. It can, in fact, be a free association of small, independent units,

such as local communities. Regional and state officers can then have a healthy relationship to the local communities, and the "intermediate unit" can be the representative of a cooperating group of autonomous communities. This principle of local autonomy, with groups of autonomous units setting up auxiliary service organizations, is not an abstract theory about democracy, but has operated successfully in many relationships. For example, in the vicinity of Washington there are more than 200 cooperative nursery schools, initiated by parent groups, which have federated and formed a service pool.

The metropolitan district of Toronto, consisting of thirteen separate suburbs and the central city, while maintaining the autonomy of the suburbs and of their educational departments, created a superior governmental unit, with a superior department of education. This government is controlled by the several units, which is different from being swallowed up by the big city.

The auxiliary service pool is beginning to emerge in industry. In Finland several industrial fields have each created cooperative central services. In metal manufacture, for instance, more than a hundred small firms set up a central cooperative bureau which serves the common needs in research, labor relations, financial arrangements, purchases, sales, planning for equipment and buildings, and in other ways. As a result a small firm with ten to a hundred employees has these services on an equality with the largest corporations. Moreover, in the interplay of experience of many firms there are more sources of creative thinking than in a single large firm.

American banking consists mostly of independent local units, yet freely uses the services of correspondent banks and of the Federal Reserve System. These locally independent banks have rendered a wider and higher order of service than the highly centralized banks of Canada and England. Their executives and administrators have first-hand, intimate acquaintance with local conditions, and do not need to refer to distant headquarters, as do branch banks in Canada.

In the case of community schools, the provision of auxiliary service pools—"intermediate units"—can overcome the chief handicap of small community schools. Democracy, like any other form of social activity, can survive and flourish only by the constant exercise of creative ability to keep in adjustment to reality. It requires somewhat more creative ability to develop auxiliary services than to spend money in consolidating schools and building massive school buildings.

* * *

How can lay initiative in the community help bring about the adoption of successful community schools? What is the experience of modern educational practice with small schools?

In Yellow Springs, the Antioch College education department has developed a small elementary school, with active parent participation, to see whether it can be educationally sound and financially feasible. Perhaps the most important discovery from operating this school is concerned with group relationships among the children and their families. Those responsible for the school believe that the needed security relationship of the children—with each knowing the others—requires that the school be limited to about sixty children. It was found that as the attendance was raised beyond that number a point was soon reached where the group began to become less secure and more impersonal. A corresponding falling off in the intimate and understanding relations of the parents with each other and with the school was also observed.

A similar benefit from small schools was found by accident in the suburbs of El Paso, Texas, where through a building emergency an experiment with small "cottage schools" for the first few grades was socially enriching, *less expensive*, and psychologically better for the children. El Paso, consequently, is aiming toward small elementary schools. The same is true of Kalamazoo.

So small a rural school requires giving up the separate grades for each age group that are possible in larger schools, but this course is believed to be educationally desirable. The natural and until recent times the only way for children to grow toward maturity has been in the presence of those who are older or younger. It is by observing those slightly older than themselves that children in a normal community do much of their learning.

* * *

The way in which a new idea is advocated and brought into practice has great bearing on the outcome. The question is often asked, "How will this change be brought about? Where will the necessary leadership come from? This approach arises out of a general misconception of social change. We tend to think in terms of propaganda campaigns, indoctrination, of the power of inspired leadership in each community to galvanize the entire community into a new course of action.

The new developments we anticipate in rural education and in community living can be harmed by our seeking to impose them. People resent being pressed to novel action. However, given a clear example of successful action, they are eager to repeat it. Town manager government waited for a century in our country, but once given a successful demonstration in a small city it spread like wildfire, until now several hundred municipalities have adopted it of their own initiative. That is the fundamental process of

democratic action. Leadership should consist in creating, facilitating and reporting progress, not in propaganda and coercion.

Too much emphasis has been given to achieving change and advance through the leadership of large established groups and organizations; too little to the creation of small new beginnings. We would do well to use the present time of large increase in school-age children as opportunity for helping those who care to begin new small schools, not just to enlarge existing institutions.

One of the biggest unproven experiments in all educational history is the massive school consolidation movement. The wholesale taking of young children out of their community settings and the herding of them into large masses, with the widespread destruction of community life, is unprecedented in history. On the other hand, reliance on parent and community initiative in the development of childhood is even older than mankind.

One small school, honestly and competently and creatively administered, will be an inspiration to many others. It is possible for a group of parents and neighbors to organize and administer a small neighborhood school, as did our ancestors, putting into practice the best educational methods now available. Pacific Ackworth School in California is such an undertaking. It has high standards and a fine morale, and like our cooperative nursery schools has been as valuable in knitting the parents together as in giving the children the best schooling to be had. Once concerned people realize what they can do with their initiative, they go all out in building and supporting schools for their children—and for themselves. But it must be truly their own enterprise. With such enterprise there is almost no shortage of teachers, or limitation of finance, or problem of morale, that cannot be overcome.

Lacking a sense of freedom to pioneer educationally, many communities, parents, teachers and school administrators at all levels have felt severe frustration. The following are examples.

A progressive village under state and county rigid supervision usually had difficulty in finding a school superintendent. Then it became an "exempted village," with power of autonomous home administration. Thereupon the applicants for the superintendent's position were many, including men of a high order. They were attracted by the freedom to do an independent and superior job of administration. Yet in that state the state department of education finally secured legislation prohibiting any more communities from achieving the status of "exempted village."

In a university town many families enjoyed the progressive character and intimate participation in the operation of the university school. Parents were reluctant to move into an expanding rural neighborhood because their

children would have to go into a rigid county school system which allowed none of the parent and child initiative they had learned to value.

A recent study of what people desire in choosing locations for their own homes revealed that one of the major factors in determining a location was desire for a school system open to their participation and democratic control—a primary condition of small community responsibility. In a large school system even parents with good capacity to deal with organizational procedure commonly find themselves frustrated in their efforts to achieve any of their purposes or concerns with regard to the schooling of their children. It may be truly as serious to them as to see their children brought up in the church of another faith. Such needs cannot be met by moving to another school district if so large districts are nearly universal.

Such problems are examples of the need for building schools in relation to the community. The conditions and opportunities of our communities vary so greatly that we must recognize and welcome diversity in working out our pressing school problems. It is among some of the experimental deviations from customary practice that the most productive developments occur.

The community school and community initiative in education are not panaceas to be imposed on all areas and all communities. Perhaps only a minority of small communities are now mature enough, or care enough, to bring about a high level of community involvement in school affairs. But even if the proportion of communities now capable of reaching a passable level of initiative should prove to be relatively small, the communities which do have initiative constitute a major hope. They should be encouraged to exercise freedom and autonomy. They should not be coerced into standardization and dependence, as is commonly the case today. There should be wide tolerance of variation from conventional patterns of effective operation. Some communities are at present so lacking in life and interest that their schools for the present should be administered as a *trusteeship* by a higher authority. *The concept of trusteeship* for immature communities, during which every trace of initiative is encouraged to grow, and all capacity for local autonomy is nurtured, is a far cry from the bureaucratic dictation of school policy from above which is characteristic of some state administrations, and which tends to destroy initiative.

To try to impose a wholesale program for autonomous small community school operation where the capacity for such operation does not exist might result in such widespread failure as to discredit the general concept. The American community school has not had a generally available source of auxiliary services such as is envisioned by the concept of so-called intermediate units. With such auxiliary service available, great change might occur in our rural schools without coercion, and that quickly.

The state, by right and by necessity, has a residual control over community education, just as it has a residual right of control over family life. Under ordinary circumstances a family is autonomous in its internal life. In law "A man's house is his castle." That is the case even where the family is not very well managed. When the internal relations of a family fail to meet the minimum standards of society, then the state may step in to correct the situation. Very generally, pronounced cultural changes should begin as voluntary movements. Only as a cultural pattern is generally accepted and commonly practiced do public sanctions become appropriate.

Centralization of control of local functions is based on disbelief in democracy. It is a residual control in the nature of trusteeship which the state properly has over local community education. We know that the need for trusteeship, with provision for assistance, counsel and service, is widespread, and in some states is well provided. A reasonable degree of centralization of consulting services, of guidance facilities, and of administrative assistance may be a matter of economical use of resources, and is essential to effective democracy.

As long as the American people are willing to cheat their children out of a decent opportunity for self-development by herding them into school-pens like a lot of sheep, it is sheer hypocrisy to wring our hands in despair and wonder why we have so many moral, mental, and physical breakdowns. Only if the teacher can know her pupils as individuals and treat them as such can we counteract the trend toward anonymity which is the curse of our society. . . .

The highly developed gang life which is now a characteristic of every large city is nothing but a defense mechanism against the feeling of solitude that affects adults as well as youth in our large-scale industrial society. . . .

We are bound to produce more and more unfortunate products like these [junior high school culprits] unless we can build an atmosphere in our public schools which will cushion the individual child against the influence of our mass civilization and its frightening depersonalization of the individual.

—AGNES E. MEYER, in "Schoolboy Racketeers,"
Atlantic, Vol. 193, No. 3 (March 1954).

IS THE COUNTRY SCHOOL DOOMED?

by LAURA LANE

Reprinted from *The Country Gentleman*, September 1950

There are still a lot of rural communities in this country where the terms "school consolidation" and "district reorganization" are fighting words. Though it's doubtful if any blood has been shed, tempers are still being lost, tables pounded, and feuds prolonged over the question: How far shall rural school consolidation go?

In Wisconsin, where the battle over reorganization continues after 25 years, the Winneconne Community School District is an island of peace.

Parents rejoice that the younger children can learn their three R's close to home and the older ones needn't be exported to a city high school, though there is one nearby. Educators believe they have found a pattern that will work elsewhere in Wisconsin and wherever the tug of war over the one-room school is prolonged. And the kids from the Winnebago County dairy farms are glad for friendly schools and short bus rides.

The merging of 20 small districts into the Winneconne Community School District was achieved without organized opposition and remains successful for a number of reasons. The idea wasn't forced upon the citizens from the state capitol, as has sometimes been the case. The decisions to join the community district were made democratically after the parents were convinced of the advantages of an integrated system. And the idea didn't spring up overnight. Actually, fusion of twenty tiny districts into one fairly large one required public discussion and a series of elections over a period of 10 years. No district was ever "annexed."

Having a single school district doesn't mean that all the children go to school in Winneconne, population 931. Practically all children in the first six grades go to ten rural schools close to home; those in the seventh and eighth grades and above ride the bus into Winneconne, where they can use the gymnasium, science laboratories and library. There they also can have classes in agriculture, shop, home economics and commercial subjects. The bus routes are remarkably short. That's because of the large number of buses and carryalls used. More than half of the elementary school children ride a bus 20 minutes or less en route to school, and more than half of the high-school students ride 40 minutes or less.

The toughest problems to solve in building such a district were the financial ones, since joining meant increasing the taxes for some sections

and lowering them in others. The rate now is 9.2 mills, compared with an average of 14 mills for the state of Wisconsin.

It is generally agreed that these Wisconsin farmers, who carry a heavier general property tax than their neighbors in most other Midwestern states and the U.S. average, would never have consented to increasing their taxes for school purposes if they hadn't believed they would get more advantages for their children for every dollar spent. The man who is most responsible for their viewpoint is G. R. Leistikow, the Winneconne principal, who has been demonstrating for more than 20 years what a good school system is like and how it works. In his efforts he has had the support of his board, of former County Superintendent Eva Monson, and of a rural committee which functioned five years before the unification took place.

Leistikow is a busy man without being a hurried one. He treats the students like people and the teachers like friends. Furthermore, he likes Winneconne so well that frequent attractive offers from other school systems haven't lured him away.

The school system is a good one because Leistikow and the school board get good teachers, pay them at a rate comparable with competing cities, with raises every year for ten years and bonuses for study leading to certificates and degrees. The whole district is on the same salary schedule, which eliminates jealousies.

Now rural teachers who formerly struggled with school problems alone welcome the constant professional counsel which reorganization provides.

Most of the outlying elementary schools are one- or two-teacher units. All have radios, telephones, pianos, and share in a county library loan service. All enjoy movies and films three times a month. Under the new system the curriculum has been expanded with classes in physical education and music under instructors who regularly visit all schools in the district.

As finances permit, the small schools are being improved. Most have movable and adjustable seats and desks, and modern heating systems. Two have indoor toilets. Local doctors cooperate in physical checkups for all school children. The district shares the service of a school nurse, and Winneconne was one of the first rural schools in the country to have psychiatric consultation. Special help is provided for all mentally and physically handicapped students as well as for the highly endowed. Twice a year the students stay home for a day and the parents come to school for conferences with teachers about the progress of their children. One of the ideas Leistikow uses to develop unity among the school patrons is an annual district-wide picnic for families.

Other small school districts or parts of them have indicated a desire to join the Winneconne district and if they do will assume their proportion of the bonded indebtedness. When the district is enlarged, the new Winne-

conne school has been planned to allow for expansion. But it's not considered advisable for the district to expand much more, or some of its advantages would be lost.

The Wisconsin Rural Schools Association, which reports affiliation of over 1500 rural school districts, is not opposed to all reorganization, but it resents the disintegration of rural community life which has followed the closing of many one-room schools throughout the state. And it insists that decisions to close or consolidate schools should be democratically determined by the ballot. Many parents, especially farm people, complain that Wisconsin's high schools and vocational schools are almost invariably located in county-seat towns and cities. . . . They've lost their rural character, many farm people believe. . . .

But what rural people have resented most has been arbitrary rearranging of district boundaries by boards of education, special committees and state legislatures without opportunity for the districts concerned to vote on proposals. . . .

Supporters of the integration method point out that where communities take the initiative in voluntary consolidating as Winneconne did, the results probably will be more satisfactory to the majority. Community boundaries are not so likely to be violated or natural trade centers be disregarded.

HOW SWITZERLAND RESISTS CENTRALIZATION*

by DEMAREE BESS

Switzerland is the only country I know where the world-wide trend toward centralized government is being firmly resisted. The Swiss constitution provides that every important question may be submitted directly to the voters in a referendum, and a recent series of these direct polls has refused to give the federal government more power. . . .

The most remarkable discovery which the Swiss have made is that social security can be carried to great lengths without putting it into politics or even into the hands of their federal government. The outstanding example is the old-age and survivors' pension plan which has been in force here since January 1, 1948. This is one of the most comprehensive pension plans in existence anywhere, covering old people, widows and orphans. . . .

*Reprinted by special permission of the *Saturday Evening Post* from an article in the issue of June 24, 1950, entitled "Truman Could Learn from the Swiss." Copyright 1950 by the Curtis Publishing Co. (This article also appeared in *Community Service News* for May-June 1951.)

‘A pension plan was skillfully drafted to appeal to the independent-minded Swiss worker. It provided a considerable range between the minimum and the maximum pensions to be paid, depending upon the worker’s life-time earnings. The federal government undertook to keep a separate record for each citizen—which could be done by a few clerks with modern machinery—so that maximum pensions would go only to those whose earnings justified them. . . . The Swiss distrust of centralized government was appeased by a provision that the twenty-two cantonal governments, which make up the Swiss Confederation, would separately handle the funds contributed by their own citizens. The federal government’s participation was restricted to providing a supervising agency. . . .

Today every Swiss male citizen is assured of a modest pension at age sixty-five, and every Swiss woman at sixty. Widows and orphans also receive pensions upon the death of husbands or fathers. Thus 100 per cent of the Swiss people are assured of old-age or survivor pensions, as compared with 29.8 per cent covered by Social Security in the United States [in 1950]. . . .

Beyond these minimums, then, a majority of the Swiss people have shown a preference for extending social security through private insurance companies, local governments and so-called friendly societies. . . .

Eighteen of the twenty-two cantonal governments operate fire-insurance monopolies and compel all residents to insure their property against loss by fire. The communes, comparable to American towns and villages, require insurance for all school children against accidents and sickness. Parents who can afford it pay the premiums; other children are insured by communal funds. . . .

The Swiss have not voted themselves free medical care, because they are very cautious about buying anything before they know what it will cost and whether they can afford it. All things considered, they prefer their own health insurance, which is centered in 1155 friendly societies, regulated by a federal office. About 3,000,000 persons, almost three fourths of the population, are enrolled in these societies, some of which are operated by local governments, some by trade-unions and industrial associations, and some by religious and fraternal organizations.

The low average administrative cost of these societies—6 per cent—is possible only because thousands of Swiss volunteers work for them without pay. Swiss insurance experts told me that these administrative costs are less than half of what commercial or state-operated schemes could be expected to achieve.

The Swiss believe that friendly societies meet their needs more efficiently than any nation-wide scheme could do, not only because of their lower operating costs but also because they are readily adjusted to local conditions. In many parts of Switzerland—notably in the large cities of Zurich, Basel

and Lucerne—citizens with incomes below fixed levels are compelled to enroll in friendly societies. Most communes pay the fees of persons who cannot afford to pay their own. Standard working agreements between employers and employees also require workers to take out this form of health insurance, with employers contributing to funds. . . .

The prolonged duration of the labor peace has fortified Swiss determination to avoid more centralization, not only in government but also in labor-management relations. An official of the Trade-Union Congress told me it will never again attempt to make detailed nation-wide working agreements like those which have caused so much conflict in the United States.

For example, in 1937, the Metal Workers and Watchmakers Union signed its first "working peace" agreement with the Employers Association, barring strikes and lockouts for a trial period. That agreement worked so well that it has been repeatedly renewed, and in 1949 was extended for five years to 1954. But detailed working agreements were then left to separate unions and enterprises. It was agreed that adjustments would be made by joint worker-employer committees at three levels—communal, cantonal and national. These committees meet at frequent intervals, not just when disputes arise or contracts are due, and thus anticipate and prevent many misunderstandings. The national organization does not even investigate local disputes until every means has been explored for settling them locally.

This decentralization of labor-management relations has worked so well in Switzerland that, after the war, Swiss trade-union leaders tried to persuade German trade-unionists to adopt similar methods. German workers had to rebuild their trade-unions from the ground up on the ruins left by Nazism, and Swiss unionists helped them with food, clothing and advice. But Dr. Waldemar Jucker, a lively young Swiss trade-union economist, told me, "At first the Germans listened to us, and we thought they were convinced. But when they became stronger, they went back to the old German system of organizing from the top down. Apparently Germans can't be happy unless they are regimented, even in trade-unions."

The community, like the individual and nation, cannot exist in isolation. Apart from a focus on the totality of value of which all are part—call that mankind or God—individuals, communities, and nations tend to be self-seeking, and consequently pathological, and destructive to each other. Both state and community are elements of society; each has its rights, neither is but a function of the other, and each conditions the other.

HOW FINLAND TRIES TO STABILIZE SMALL BUSINESS*

by ARTHUR E. MORGAN

In many parts of Finland new small industries are springing up. These are partly efforts to fill the gaps left by the breakdown of German industry, which formerly supplied many of the country's needs.

There are probably a dozen associations in Finland undertaking to supply some elements of service in the field of industrial management for small business. Several of these are still experimental and tentative. One of the more interesting and promising is the organization, formed in 1942, of many small metal industries in all parts of Finland. It has the formidable name of Metalliteollisuudenharjoittajain. With a staff of about 40 persons, "M.T.H.," as it is called, supplies a wide range of technical and managerial services to its member firms, providing them with much the same specialized skills that would be available to a great corporation.

As a curious result of certain Finnish legislation, most business associations have two legal organizations. One of these, the "ideal" corporation, as it is called, identified by the letters "r.y.," handles non-commercial matters. The other, identified by the letters, "o.y.," is concerned with technical or commercial affairs. (This rough statement would have to be greatly elaborated to make it fully intelligible.)

The small industries association has both these legal forms. "M.T.H.r.y.," the "ideal" organization, with 220 member firms, advises on problems relating to wage negotiations, wage disputes, working conditions, law cases, a periodical publication, employment, vacation programs and camps, and certain relations with the government.

The technical and commercial organization, "M.T.H. Keskus o.y.," in which 122 of the same firms are members, has a wide range of activities. It undertakes to supply its member firms with raw materials, an intricate and difficult job in present-day Finland. It takes care of foreign relations, both in purchase of materials and in delivery of reparations goods to Russia. It has a design and drafting service for designing products and preparing working drawings. A staff of efficiency engineers is available to plan factory layouts and work arrangements. It will design and build new plants for its members.

In case business is available which is too big or too varied for a single firm, the organization will make an analysis of the order and, knowing the equipment and facilities of its member firms, it will divide the job among

*Reproduced from *Community Service News*, Vol. V, No. 5 (Nov.-Dec. 1947).

several plants. It will analyze the cost of the different portions and determine what part of the wholesale price will go to each.

While I was in Finland an order was received for building a large plant to make excelsior (shredded wood). This job was beyond the available capacity of any one of several of the firms. Therefore, the central organization broke down the job into many component parts and placed these parts with thirty-four different member firms. Then it set up a thirty-fifth firm to receive and assemble the parts. Such a division of work makes necessary an inspection service to insure that the work of each member firm is acceptable. What an expansion of possibilities would such cooperation bring to small American firms!

Machine tools are very difficult to buy in Finland, and their import is prohibited, except under government license. One service of the central organization is to consult with member firms as to their respective needs in machinery, to secure import licenses, and to buy the machinery and machine tools, probably in America or England.

There comes the problem of financing. This also is a service of the organization. An individual small manufacturer might have difficulty in persuading a banker or a government department of his financial responsibility. The central organization would not recommend a loan unless persuaded of its need and its soundness. Finnish bankers told me they had great respect for this organization. That being the case, the member firms have a kind of backing for their financial requests that the American small manufacturer largely lacks.

Sales, of course, are vital, and the central organization largely takes care of them. It searches for work for its member firms. Some of the plants are using scrap war material to make goods Finland needs. In this scouting the central organization often can be more efficient than the individual manufacturer. The firms make a wide range of products from locomotives and ships to pots and pans.

Up to the present a considerable part of the production has gone to Russia, for reparations in kind. Since Russia credits what she gets only at prewar prices, whereas the machines and the steel and other raw materials purchased from America cost about two and a quarter times as much as before the war, the matter of prices paid and received is critical. Individual small industries might be lost in the complexities of the problem.

Finally there is an auditing department which gives advice on book-keeping, makes audits, and helps with income tax and other fiscal reports. This relieves the managers of small plants of annoying and time-consuming effort. During the war various small industrialists in America told me that more than half their time was given to government "red tape," and that in

consequence they had been compelled to give up industrial pioneering. Finland was greatly damaged by the war, and with heavy reparations to pay, is still in the grip of war-time restrictions and regimentation. In such circumstances a central office, onto which a small industrialist can unload his "red tape" troubles, must be a boon.

This widely varied service is supported by commissions on the sales by its member firms. The smallest of these firms has three employees, the largest 300. The smaller firms pay smaller commissions than the larger ones.

This small industries organization has been described at length because it suggests a course which might be followed by small industry in America. There is somewhat less need here than in Finland, because the spirit of industrial efficiency has more thoroughly penetrated American industry. Labor is used far more efficiently, and "know-how" is more general.

Yet, as between large and small industry in our country, large industry at present has very great advantages in access to specialized industrial management and technical services. An organization of small businesses, statewide in our larger states, or including several states where population is less dense, might make available to small businesses nearly all the specialized services now available to big business. More than that, in 200 or 1000 small businesses there would be apt to emerge a greater variety of ideas and methods than in any single large corporation.

M.T.H., with its staff of 40, does not pretend to supply all the specialized services required by its members. But it knows where to find them. It draws on the experts of the Finnish Institute of Technology, the University of Helsinki, the Work Efficiency Association, the army research staff, and on any other expert services available. It thus serves as a clearing house, getting the best services to the firm that needs them, and holds down the size of its own staff.

This is a particularly important point. There are in America many sources of business guidance, but the small industrialist often has not time to become acquainted with them. The Finnish small metal manufacturer who is a member need not spend his days and nights trying to acquaint himself with sources of help. He needs only to call on M.T.H., knowing that the best help will be available, from whatever source it may come.

Several other Finnish institutions undertake to supply technical, managerial, purchasing and sales service to their members. For instance, the Finnish Association of Tanners, Nahkatehtaitten Hankinta O.Y., serves about forty firms in the leather and tanning field. The largest of these firms has 600 employees, the smallest only five or ten. "Na Ha" handles the import of raw material and machinery, it helps find markets and arranges for licenses and export arrangements, it supplies chemical and engineering

services, designs and builds machines, handles machine repairs, and helps its members on any questions that arise. For such services it charges a small commission, about 1/5 of 1% of the business done by the firms.

The Finnish small industry association, Suomen Pienteollisuuden Keskusliitto, undertakes to supply similar services to small industry in general. It has 400 members, about 40 of which are associations which in turn have several thousand members. This association is not yet [in 1947] fully matured in its functions. The Finnish Institution for Promoting Trades trains small entrepreneurs. It has plans for services similar to those mentioned above. It is publicly financed. The Work Efficiency Association, Työtehoseura R.Y., makes efficiency studies. The Technical Institute does agricultural research.

The Foundation for Promoting Handicrafts and Small Industries has chiefly helped in financing businesses for refugees. Since 1940 it has made about 1500 loans for that purpose. Of these 800 have been repaid, while 95% of the outstanding loans are up to date on payments. There is an office in the Finnish Ministry of Commerce, directed by Arkkitchi Yyrolä, which is undertaking to develop technical services for small industries parallel to those of the other organizations mentioned.

Thus it appears that Finland is suddenly becoming aware that small industry in general cannot survive if each one must solve its technical and organizational problems by itself. Only in union will the small firms have the necessary technical strength. The sudden and independent emergence of numerous organizations to provide such unified service is a first step to that end. It is reasonably to be expected that the Finnish habit of coordination and cooperation, which is combined with intense individualism, will find a way to combine many of these efforts without loss of independence.

If some such organized business management service should be available to American small business in several fields the prospect for survival and success for American small business might greatly increase. American small business has been far ahead of that of Finland and most European countries in technology and business efficiency. But we should not rest on that preeminence. Seventy-five years ago European industry was far ahead of American in many fields because Europe had skilled craftsmen with many generations of craft tradition behind them, while in that respect America was woefully weak. American industry faced that weakness and overcame it by developing machine tools and standardized methods which largely did away with the need for traditional craftsmen. In overcoming our great weakness we shot far ahead of the rest of the world in production efficiency.

Finnish small industry has lacked the "know-how" of American small industry. The small metal manufacturers are squarely facing that fact, and have set up a form of mutual help which may be almost as great a lift to

small business as was the development of machine tools and the standardization of parts in America. Unless American small business can so organize itself that it can have the specialized technical and managerial services now available chiefly to big business, it may find it has missed its greatest opportunity for survival.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, INC.

Though government powers are necessary to many activities of society, government status and state-granted power often have serious drawbacks in promoting united effort in groups of autonomous communities. For such efforts a spirit of cooperation is the most necessary condition. Local "community councils" do not seek governmental power or status, but derive their influence from the respect accorded to a body of men representing all the civic organizations of the community. While local government is concerned with official action, the community council undertakes unofficial activities in the general community interest. It does not have power to tax, police or coerce.

Where communities unite for common ends, the same need exists for freedom, initiative and voluntary common action. Southern Illinois, Inc., a regional organization, was originated by men seeking means by which the potentially rich but economically depressed sixteen counties in Southern Illinois, where there are no large cities, could work out problems together. They wanted an organization which would recognize the fairly distinct cultural and economic region, and help to give it conscious unity; but felt that an official, elected body with governmental powers would not serve this purpose. An organization was needed composed of progressive people from many communities and of many vocations, free to think and act as a body in the interest of the whole region, rather than of political officeholders and civil servants.

Southern Illinois, Inc., has accomplished more than many a well-financed government organization, helping in active planning for the area and in creating governmental units where needed—as in the case of an airport authority. Through the efforts of its members the local state college was reorganized into a state university. A widespread consciousness has arisen that the region has values to be taken seriously and to be served. This has come through nongovernmental cooperation of many communities.

QUOTES

During Gandhi's lifetime a collection of articles concerning him was edited by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. The following is extracted from one of these articles contributed by Aldous Huxley.

The mistake of most of Gandhi's contemporaries was to suppose that technology and organization could turn the petty human animal into a superhuman being and could provide a substitute for the infinities of a spiritual realization, whose very existence it had become orthodox to deny.

For this amphibious being on the borderline between the animal and the spiritual, what sort of social, political and economic arrangements are the most appropriate? To this question Gandhi gave a simple and eminently sensible answer. Men, he said, should do their actual living and working in communities of a size commensurate with their bodily and mental stature, communities small enough to permit of genuine self-government and the assumption of personal responsibilities, federated into larger units in such a way that the temptation to abuse great power should not arise. The larger a democracy grows, the less real becomes the rule of the people and the smaller is the say of individuals and localized groups in deciding their own destinies. Moreover love and affection are essentially personal relationships. Consequently it is only in small groups that Charity, in the Pauline sense of the word, can manifest itself. Needless to say, the smallness of the group in no way guarantees the emergence of Charity between its members; but it does at least create the possibility of Charity. In a large, undifferentiated group the possibility does not even exist, for the simple reason that most of its members cannot, in the nature of things, have personal relations with one another. . . .

It is interesting to recall that, if the great apostle of Western democracy had had his way, America would now be a federation, not merely of forty-eight States, but of many thousands of self-governing wards. To the end of a long life Jefferson tried to persuade his compatriots to decentralize their government to the limit. "As Cato concluded every speech with the words, *Carthago delenda est*, so do I every opinion with the injunction, 'Divide the counties into wards.' " His aim, in the words of Professor John Dewey, "was to make the wards 'little republics, with a warden at the head of each, for all those concerns which being under their eye, they could better manage than the larger republics of the county or State' . . . In short, they were to exercise directly, with respect to their own affairs, all the functions of government, civil and military. In addition, when any important wider matter came up for decision, all wards would be called into meeting on the same day, so that the collective sense of the whole people would be produced. The plan was not adopted. But it was an essential part of his political philosophy,

because that philosophy, like Gandhi's philosophy, was essentially ethical and religious. In his view, all human beings are born equal, inasmuch as all are the children of God. Being the children of God, they have certain rights and certain responsibilities—rights and responsibilities which can be exercised most effectively within a hierarchy of self-governing republics, rising from the ward through the State to the Federation.

"Other days," writes Professor Dewey, "bring other words and other opinions behind the words that are used. The terms in which Jefferson expressed his belief in the moral criterion for judging all political arrangements and his belief that republican institutions are the only ones that are legitimate are not now current. It is doubtful, however, whether defence of democracy against the attacks to which it is subjected does not depend upon taking once more the position Jefferson took about its moral basis and purpose, even though we have to find another set of words in which to formulate the moral ideal served by democracy. A renewal of faith in common human nature, in its potentialities in general and in its power in particular, to respond to reason and truth, is a surer bulwark against totalitarianism than is demonstration of material success or devout worship of special legal and political forms."

Gandhi, like Jefferson, thought of politics in moral and religious terms. That is why his proposed solutions bear so close a resemblance to those proposed by the great American. That he went further than Jefferson—for example, in recommending economic as well as political decentralization and in advocating the use of satyagraha in place of the ward's "elementary exercise of militia"—is due to the fact that his ethic was more radical and his religion more profoundly realistic than Jefferson's. Jefferson's plan was not adopted; nor was Gandhi's. So much the worse for us and our descendants.*

In 1830 Sir Charles Metcalf was the Governor General of India. This is what he records of Indian village communities:

They seem to last where nothing else lasts. . . . The union of the village communities, each one forming a separate little state by itself, has, I conceive, contributed more than any other cause to the preservation of the people of India through all revolutions and changes which they have suffered, and it is in high degree conducive to their happiness and to the enjoyment of a great portion of freedom and independence. I wish, therefore, that the village con-

*From "A Note on Gandhi," by Aldous Huxley, *Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on His Life and Work*, edited by S. Radhakrishnan (London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1949, 15 shillings, 557 pages), pp. 404-407.

stitutions may never be disturbed and I dread everything that has a tendency to break them up.

Today there are villages, but no longer village communities. Their industries have been completely destroyed. They no longer have their land. They are now poor, diseased, idle.

—M. N. CHATTERJEE

As a permanent and thorough solution of the metropolitan problem there is only one alternative to complete city-county consolidation and that is some form of borough plan, a two-level or federated government in which a central agency, the county in this case, exercises enhanced powers, but the existing municipalities retain their identity and substantial autonomy. Obviously such a plan is a compromise between the common interests of the metropolitan area and local patriotism. It can do two things, however, if well devised: (1) It can provide for the performance on a county-wide basis of those functions which cannot otherwise be provided efficiently and economically; (2) it can rectify the present unequal distribution of tax burdens by shifting from municipalities to the county some of the more costly functions of concern to the whole metropolis. In this way industries and individuals which now escape municipal taxation in whole or in part would contribute without unnecessary hardship to the support of the great economic community.

It is of the greatest importance therefore that the possibilities of the borough plan should be explored thoroughly.

—From a report to the Stephen H. Wilder Foundation, "The Cincinnati Area Must Solve Its Metropolitan Problems," by Doris D. and Thomas H. Reed, Cincinnati, 1953.

In the book, *Fire in the Ashes*, by Theodore H. White, is a description of France just after the end of the German occupation. It gives a picture of the price which France still pays for the theory of centralized government inherited from Rousseau. The following is an extract from that account:

The law crept back gradually because people needed it. But Paris control returned more slowly. It was over a year later, in December, 1945, before Toulouse felt the first tug of Paris restraint. A sugar riot had taken place in Toulouse that month and a great warehouse of sugar had been stormed.

Pierre, as Commissioner, had sent first one company of police and then ■ second to stop the riot, but none had come back to report. At four in the morning, therefore, Pierre drove to the warehouse to see what had happened and found all quiet. In the entry of the warehouse, however, he found a large basket full of parcels of sugar. There were fifty-four parcels and on each was marked the name of one of the policemen sent to keep order: the rioters had shared the sugar with the police and each policeman had marked a package with his name before going back to the barracks to sleep. That morning Pierre dismissed each of the fifty-four who had accepted sugar. And only two days later came the order from Paris: reinstate each of the fifty-four pending a full judicial investigation! Paris had begun to govern again; only on authority from Paris could a policeman five hundred miles away be fired.

Between the Liberation and the end of 1945, for ■ period of almost a year and a half, France had had no real national government—and France was governed better than for many a decade. For centuries before, Paris had drawn to itself all the brains, all the scholars, all the leadership of France until the beautiful capital city suffered from cerebral congestion, and the rest of France was a political desert. The design of ■ village schoolhouse, the opening of a new waterworks, the erection of a new bridge anywhere in France rested upon decision in Paris, hundreds of miles away, as it rests again today. But under the Occupation and during the Liberation, when Paris could not function as capital of the nation, the brains and talents of France were scattered all across the country and the great provincial cities—Lyons, Marseille, Bordeaux, Grenoble—became regional capitals in their own right, centers of proud men making their own decisions.

Toulouse, where Pierre Bertaux governed as Commissioner of southwest France, was now a regional capital in its own right, and it was with unbelievable excitement and enthusiasm that the people whom Pierre led preceeded to rule themselves. Before the war local criticism of affairs had to wait for a national election to voice itself in a new selection of deputies to be sent to Paris. Now, Pierre found, a critic could be silenced by putting him on a regional committee and telling him to cure what was bothering him.

Such a system could not last long, for by the end of 1945 the men of political talent and ambition were gathering again in Paris. It was clear that they could not govern France from Paris as before, if regional governments divided authority with central government everywhere beyond Paris' suburban borders. Prewar deputies in Paris had been accustomed to thinking of themselves as big men, the givers of favors and dispensers of patronage in each little department from which they came. The deputies could not now control the new officials in the Liberated regions, each of whom directed half a dozen or more little departments in an area as large as an American state. The ministers of government disliked the regional governments, the civil services disliked them, and the Communists disliked them most of all because it was the regional governments like that of Toulouse which had

frustrated their bid for power in the hot days of insurrection and revolt. The Communists, in France as elsewhere, wanted a strong central government. In those days the Communists sat in the French Cabinet and their bitterness was unrelenting.

In the spring of 1946, therefore, on March 31, the national government in Paris announced the dissolution of all regional governments, and with that the war, for Pierre, had come to an end. He no longer had an apartment to live in; he was in debt; he was tired. With Denise and his children, Pierre rented a cottage in the Pyrenees and went off for a long summer of rest in the mountains until fall should come and he might return to Toulouse to teach German.*

As we have suggested elsewhere in this issue, those who search for the source of the long-time weakness and present deterioration in the government of France might well make a study of the effect of centralization of government, and of the destruction of local autonomy.

One night I asked a world-wise old Chinese diplomat what he thought would happen on the mainland. "Have you ever been in China?" he asked me. When I said I had not, he said that all over China I would find villages, much as in India, and that in every village there would be a tea house. Every day at the tea hour the people, especially the wiser people of the village, gather to talk. At that same time people all over China are talking in nearly a million villages.

"Chiang lost because this great 'village jury' decided that he had failed," the old man explained. "The villagers came to the point where they felt that the Communists could not be any worse." He said that there were military battles after that, but once the jury decided that Chiang was through, it was just a question of time.

"As long as the 'tea house jury' of China supports Mao Tse-tung his government will remain strong and there is little that Chiang or the United States can do," the elder statesman continued. "But, if that jury ever brings in a verdict against Mao, then his regime will fall or be ready for a change."

—CHESTER BOWLES, *Ambassador's Report*
(New York, Harper & Brothers, 1954,
415 pages), pp. 372-3.

*Theodore H. White, *Fire in the Ashes: Europe in Mid-Century* (New York, William Sloane Associates, Publishers, 1953, 405 pages, \$5.00; Copyright 1953 by Theodore H. White), pp. 118-120. Reprinted by permission.

BOOK REVIEWS

Autonomous Groups Bulletin for Summer-Autumn 1952* undertakes a critical study of the nature of community, of the nature and functions of formal and informal associations, and of the nature of leadership. (The terms formal and informal in describing communities are used to replace older terms for these types of social organization, such as status and contract, *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*, sacred and secular, etc. The terms formal and informal seem to be an improvement.) Where much of the writing in this field has been traditional and intuitionist, we have here an effort to express the results of critical, logical inquiry. Where some of the older sociologists, Maine, Tönnies, LePlay and Cooley, may perhaps be charged with seeing formal and informal organizations as contrasting, and almost as antithetical, this discussion treats them as interrelated and as mutually necessary. The *Bulletin* will help to clarify and to define the terms and concepts of rural sociologists, and thereby to make discussions in that field more informative and intelligible.

The discussion of formal and informal organization is particularly worthwhile. We quote:

Community and culture are not the only offspring of the protean Informal Organization complex. *It is the matrix from which the complex of Formal Organization arises.* The attitudes, customs, and values of Informal Organization are partly expressed through Formal Organizations which, once organized, it continues to nourish and qualify. Without Informal Organization. Formal Organizations could not come into being and could not survive. *The relationship of the two complexes is symbiotic; they are interdependent aspects of the same phenomenon. . . .*

To persist at all and to perform the functions for which they were created. Formal Organizations *are dependent upon the concurrent emergence within them of informal systems of interaction that regularize the interpersonal relationships of their members and/or personnel, who in small systems develop mutual understanding, intercommunication, common aversions and beliefs, habitual ways of doing things, and common expectations regarding one another's behavior. . . .* No sooner does a Formal Organization arise out of the Informal Organization complex than it depends for survival upon the development of associated systems of informal character to sustain

**Autonomous Groups Bulletin*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Summer-Autumn, 1952), published by the Committee on Autonomous Groups, 1004 Hotel Ambassador, New York 22, N.Y.

its efforts. Thus the complex of Informal Organization comprises not only the systems of interaction from which Formal Organizations emerge, but also the associated systems that develop within each Formal Organization. . . .

It is the peculiar distinction of the modern totalitarian State that, in contradistinction to ancient forms of tyranny, it seeks to obliterate Informal Organization and to force all human association into officially designed channels. . . .

The impersonal type of human association is the "ideal" of Formal Organizations. . . .

It is universally true that participants in formal systems, mostly without explicit awareness, develop their own protections against carrying the "ideal" of depersonalization too far; they spontaneously organize the informal systems. . . . These are absolutely indispensable to mitigate the strains of participation in the activities of a Formal Organization; without them the individual personality is in danger of disintegration.

The third part of this *Autonomous Groups Bulletin* makes application of the theory to *Leadership and Authority in the Local Community*. The following quotations are pertinent to the subject of the present collection of articles.

Because of its peculiar nature, the complex of Formal Organizations is, *ipso facto*, a social problem in every advanced technological society. Nowhere is this more sharply evident than in the modern local community. . . .

Formal Organizations possess inherent life that impels them to expand their activities. When this expansion takes a direction counter to the wishes or desires of the local community's Informal Organization, the latter has not yet evolved methods of controlling it. . . .

The acuteness of the problem becomes especially noticeable when we take account of Formal Organizations like the welfare departments of federal, state and municipal governments, public school systems, and voluntary welfare agencies. *These public and private organizations are dealing directly with the general population. Their powers are so great that executive leaders who are unaware—and due to lack of appropriate education most executives are unaware—of the source of their authority, can make of these institutions monolithic structures to which the public which they are organized to serve becomes little more than a jumble of "faceless men."*

The public school systems of many cities are a case in point. Parents can be shut out of the schools their children attend so effectively that their only means of making *their* authority and opinion felt is by strikes, riots, and other violent acts, of which innumerable instances are daily reported in newspapers throughout the country. Their experience makes parents feel that the initial delegation of authority to the school is shockingly abused.

So far they have not been able to invent effective methods of dealing with what they regard as usurpation of authority by executive leaders of public schools. School officials, to protect themselves from violent spontaneous action by parents, are now "organizing" communities. So, for other or similar reasons, are welfare departments, health departments, recreation agencies, etc., etc. It is obvious that "community organization" by authoritarian executive hierarchies can never be anything more than the organization of "captive communities." Moreover, duplication of such satrapies by authoritarian Formal Organizations exacerbates the situation created by the segmentation of Informal Organization previously discussed.

An equilibrium between the complex of Informal Organization and that of Formal Organizations must obviously be re-established in the local community or the community must inevitably succumb to the disintegrating effect of over-powerful Formal Organizations.

(There follows a discussion of this problem, with suggestions for solving it.)

The Community School and the Intermediate Unit, Yearbook 1954, Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1954, 259 pages, \$3.00.

School consolidation characteristically has been a process of ending the existence of community schools and of creating in their place much larger units each of which serves several communities. During the past seven years nearly 40,000 community schools have been consolidated in this way. Aside from financial economies which have been claimed for large units, the chief justification for consolidation has been the possibility for supplying a wider range of subject matter and of services. How otherwise could a small school of, say, twenty-five to a hundred pupils, be able to have educational opportunities on a par with those of city schools?

This *Yearbook* shows how it is possible for relatively small community schools to have a high quality and wide range of service while retaining the advantages of intimate community life. This result can be brought about by providing a group of community schools with a central pool of auxiliary services, which in the *Yearbook* is called the "intermediate unit."

Such services can be provided, and in a considerable number of cases are being provided, in nearly every field where they might be needed. The several chapters of the *Yearbook* describe varied services that can be made available from a central pool.

In a chapter on "Administrative Services" there is a discussion of accounting, auditing, budgeting, and financial reporting, cared for by an "intermediate unit" or service pool. The fields of building, planning and maintenance are similarly covered, with training courses in maintenance. The management of pupil transportation and the maintenance of transportation equipment also can profit by centralized supervision, as can purchasing of equipment and supplies.

Under auxiliary services to pupils are included library, visual aid material, instruction in special fields such as music, graphic arts, physical education, recreation, reading improvement, and services for disabled or atypical pupils. Guidance, counseling, testing, attendance and health services are supplied in various auxiliary pools.

In a similar way service pools for assistance to teachers are concerned with teaching materials, counsel in curriculum development, and inservice training for teachers.

Under each of these subjects the discussions are largely made up of descriptions of auxiliary service programs actually under way. The reader is impressed by the wide adoption of modern "intermediate units" or auxiliary service organizations in all parts of America. We seem to have here the emergence of an effective method for preserving local autonomy and initiative while making possible for relatively small community schools a quality of service on a level with that of large consolidated schools.

The *Yearbook* is the joint product of several persons. In some places one observes that there still is unconscious acceptance of the top-down organization of society and education. For instance, we read:

When any kind of public activity is decentralized, particularly in instances where local constituencies are involved, there is always a question *as to which functions should be retained* in the central office and which should be *allocated* to the intermediate and local units. . . . A function should be *allocated* to that unit closest to the people where it can be carried out with completeness, equity, and efficiency.

Here we have a continuity of the doctrine that government begins at the top and is *allocated* downward. In point of historical fact, the community is the oldest and most basic unit of society beyond the family, and exists in its own right, a right which central government may have the power to ignore, but which it cannot ignore or violate in equity or wisdom.

On the whole this *Yearbook*, by bringing together accounts of "intermediate units" or auxiliary service pools as they are developing in many parts of the country, has performed a signal service.

—ARTHUR E. MORGAN

Building a Better Home Town: A Program of Community Self-Analysis and Self-Help, by H. Clay Tate (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1954, xvi, 236 pp., \$3.50). Introduction by Baker Brownell.

Mr. Tate is editor of the Bloomington, Illinois, *Daily Pantagraph*. In that capacity he has striven for a good many years to stimulate the development of his own community of Bloomington, and also the constellation of communities surrounding it. His efforts have been successful to a marked degree, and as a result these several communities exhibit a very considerable increase of alertness, activity and purposefulness. Out of his first-hand experiences he discusses a wide range of community concerns, and indicates steps taken for the betterment of communities such as those of his own area.

The portions of his book which are of direct interest for our present theme deal with the need for cooperation between nearby communities. A few quotations will convey the essence of his argument.

Woodrow Wilson said: "The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental powers, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of powers, we are resisting the process of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

The village, town, small city, and rural area is incomplete when it stands alone. Each depends upon the other to make up the whole community. . . . There are some problems of the small rural community which cannot be solved by the community itself, but must be tackled by the larger community. Yet the field is virtually unexplored.

There are numerous planning bodies for regions of various sizes and they have various motives. There are zoning boards and study groups, but the cooperative effort of people themselves to cope with the economic, social, and civic problems on the tertiary community level is virtually unknown today. The will to launch such a project is lacking for the most part and the techniques to put it into effect are non-existent. (pp. 221-222)

The author could accept Lewis Mumford's statement before the American Institute of Architects in 1950: "Regional planning is not a method for prescribing to a small town a more effective way of becoming big than the older centers followed; nor is it a method of preparing the small town to accept and hasten its ultimate fate of being devoured and absorbed by the continuing expansion of the neighboring metropolis. The kind of regional planning that concerns the small town is that which is devoted to giving the region as a whole, and the small town as an integral unit in the region, the advantages that were hitherto monopolized by the big city, whilst safeguarding the rural primeval elements in the region." . . .

Mr. Mumford, like most others grappling with this problem, realizes the lack of authority to develop a region in this manner. When, however,

he proposes a regional authority with power to float bonds, to make investments in new communities, to zone urban and rural areas, plan new cities, buy land for public use, fix industrial sites, and so on, the author cannot agree. It is a much slower process, but more democratic and, in the long run, more permanent if people will rally around their common interests as they develop until they find the cluster of communities making up a region working voluntarily in harmony for the good of all. . . . The major effort toward developing the tertiary community on the broad scope envisioned here must be confined for the time being to education. (pp. 223-224)

We cannot agree with this last comment of the author that groups of communities should not have power to finance mutual undertakings. Rather we find ourselves in agreement with Mumford. In some cases water supplies can be more easily developed for several communities in one project than by several communities working separately. A recreation project providing for the purchase of a tract of wooded land, and perhaps for the creation of a lake, may be carried out by a group of communities where it would be impossible for any one alone. This reviewer as an engineer has carried through more than two score of such projects, mostly in the middle west, and believes that permissive legislation for doing so is a highly valuable social resource, and that the method should be much expanded. Experience has demonstrated that people in general have a desire for insurance of fair treatment in the distribution of the burden of cost for such undertakings which makes a legal judicial determination of relative burdens almost a condition of success. Mr. Tate in effect takes a similar position in approving governmental consolidation of school districts.

It would seem that whether or not Mr. Tate would approve of intercommunity financial cooperation under legislative codes would depend on usage rather than on general principle; for in the matter of school consolidation he seems to approve the wholesale consolidation program which has been put through in Illinois, with considerable elements of coercion, though that program includes provisions for mandatory sharing of costs by groups of communities.

On the whole this is a refreshing book, telling, as it does, the story of a productive program for community development in the words of the man most responsible for that program.

—ARTHUR E. MORGAN